Class 92 Book B935
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

A LIFE

OF

GILBERT BURNET

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER.
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS.
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

[*All Rights reserved*]

A LIFE
OF
GILBERT BURNET
BISHOP OF SALISBURY

I. SCOTLAND 1643—1674

By T. E. S. CLARKE, B.D.

Minister of Saltoun

II. ENGLAND 1674—1715

With Bibliographical Appendixes

By H. C. FOXCROFT,

Editor of "A Supplement to Burnet's History of his Own Time"

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By C. H. FIRTH, M.A.

Regius Professor of Modern History, Oxford

CAMBRIDGE
at the University Press
1907

CAMBRIDGE

92
B935

45214

That...which is called...*passion* is often necessary to animate us to great undertakings, and to support us in difficult performances; and if a man could...root it out of his mind...it would mightily emasculate the vigour of his active powers.

BURNET, *Funeral Sermon on James Houblon* [1680], p. 9.

He that never makes a blunder never makes anything.

YALE MEDICAL
LIBRARY
NEW HAVEN

PREFACE.

THE scheme of the following work demands some explanation. It originated with the present writer; whose attention, during some years, had been claimed by the task of editing, for the Clarendon Press, English Historical Society, and Scottish History Society respectively, the memoirs and autobiography of Bishop Burnet, with portions of his correspondence. These researches seemed to justify a new *Life* of Burnet, which was accordingly outlined. Hope of additional material induced application to Saltoun Manse, Burnet's early home, for such traditions of his ministry as might linger in the parish. These were courteously supplied; but since it appeared that Mr Clarke had himself in contemplation a similar project, with special reference to Burnet's Scotch experience, it seemed better to produce one complete, than two imperfect biographies. Actual collaboration being impossible, a division of the subject became imperative. The rough draft already prepared (so far as it related to the initial stages of the *Life*) was placed at Mr Clarke's disposal; while Mr Clarke contributed some valuable memoranda to Part II, which are duly acknowledged *in locis*. Either writer, however, accepts unreserved responsibility for the chapters actually contributed.

Among existing sources of information, the most important are the memoirs and autobiography; and special thanks are due to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press,

who were good enough to waive, in respect of the present work, all copyright claims. The fine collection of Burnet MSS., acquired some seventy years ago, from a descendant of the Bishop, by the Bodleian Library[1], afforded much additional material. The British Museum and Lambeth Palace Libraries supplied some useful correspondence; while unpublished letters of first-rate significance were unearthed, with the sanction of the respective authorities, from the Hanoverian archives and the Library of the Remonstrants, Amsterdam. The author of Part I is under obligations to the Marquis of Tweeddale, who kindly permitted the inspection of the Lauderdale MSS. at Yester, and to Mr P. B. Swinton, through whom that permission was obtained. The Earl of Dysart gave an equally generous access to the Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House. This collection (of which the Lauderdale Papers, now in the British Museum, and partly published by Dr Airy, once formed part) is neither calendared nor arranged. A thorough investigation was impossible in the time at the present writer's disposal; but extracts were made, which proved of real importance. It may be added that every work justly attributable to Burnet, with two insignificant exceptions, has been consulted for the purposes of the work. Where possible Burnet's own language has been employed; more especially where it has been practicable to cite the racy and vigorous terms of the memoirs and autobiography. Spelling and punctuation, as a general rule, conform to modern usage; but a few specimens are given in seventeenth century orthography.

[1] *N. and Q.*, 2nd Ser. Vol. x. p. 105. These papers (save the MSS. of the *History Own Time* employed by Routh and Airy) were long ignored. Pocock used a few, when editing *Hist. Reform.*; but otherwise they were untouched till investigated (almost it would appear simultaneously) by the present writer, and by Mr H. W. Davis, whose excellent little sketch of Burnet will be found in *Typical English Churchmen.*

The author of Part I takes this occasion of thanking his friend the Rev. Dr P. Hay Hunter for his great help in reading the proofs of that Part. The present writer is obliged to Prof. S. Cramer who kindly collated the careful transcripts of the Amsterdam letters made by Mr J. Scherpenhuysen.

The references and notes are postponed to Appendix I. Owing to an accidental misunderstanding, the mode of reference differs as between the two Parts. Mr Clarke's figures relate to the *commencement* of the passage annotated; those of Part II refer to its *end*.

For the *Bibliography*, *List of Letters*, and *Index*[1] the present writer is entirely responsible. The task was simplified by the obliging loan of twenty volumes from the excellent library belonging to Saltoun Manse. This library, which still receives an annual addition under the terms of Bishop Burnet's Will, is exceptionally rich in rare works relative to the Bishop.

Exception may possibly be taken to the stress laid on the religious and theological aspect of Burnet's career, as opposed to the political interest, which is more usually emphasized. A suspicion might even arise that professional sympathies had biassed, in this respect, the author of Part I. It will be observed, however, that Part II, where no such prepossessions can exist, and where the attitude is of necessity purely historical, presents the same feature. In truth (whatever the personal opinions of writer or reader) an impartial study of Burnet's career and writings but substantiates his own statement, "My thoughts have run "most, and dwelt longest, on the concerns of the Church "and religion."

The main difficulty of both writers has been to compress, within limits, the mass of material available. The work

[1] Owing to pressure of circumstances, the Introduction is less fully Indexed than the rest of the work.

was originally planned on a somewhat larger scale. The condensation which circumstances rendered necessary was greatly assisted by the suggestions of Professor Firth; to whom the authors, no less than the public, are indebted for his valuable *Introduction*.

In conclusion, a hope is expressed that this picture of a varied career, and a vivacious personality, may attract the general reader, as well as the historical student.

H. C. FOXCROFT.

15 *August* 1907.

CONTENTS

		PAGES
PREFACE.	By H. C. FOXCROFT	v—viii
ADDENDA, CORRIGENDA, ERRATA	. . . . .	x
INTRODUCTION.	By PROFESSOR FIRTH	xi—xlvi

PART I. SCOTLAND.

By T. E. S. CLARKE.

CHAPTER		
I.	FAMILY, HOME-LIFE AND TRAINING . . .	3—21
II.	YOUTH, FRIENDS AND EARLY TRAVELS . . .	22—51
III.	LIFE AND WORK IN SALTOUN	52—79
IV.	PROFESSOR IN GLASGOW	80—128

PART II. ENGLAND.

By H. C. FOXCROFT.

V.	LONDON UNDER CHARLES II	131—206
VI.	IN EXILE UNDER JAMES II	207—250
VII.	THE REVOLUTION	251—264
VIII.	REIGN OF WILLIAM AND MARY	265—331
IX.	REIGN OF WILLIAM III	332—391
X.	REIGN OF ANNE; HANOVERIAN ACCESSION; DEATH OF BURNET; CONCLUSION	392—484

APPENDICES.

I *a*.	NOTES TO PART I. By T. E. S. CLARKE . .	485—491
I *b*.	NOTES TO PART II. By H. C. FOXCROFT . .	491—521
II.	BIBLIOGRAPHY „ „ . .	521—556
III.	LIST OF BURNET'S LETTERS „ „ . .	557—566
	INDEX „ „ . .	567—586

ADDENDA

p. 17, l. 37 *add note*:

His theses are in the Bodleian (Diss. B. B., 301, Art. 10).

p. 248, l. 38 *add note*:

A large number of MS. Sermons are among the Burnet MSS. in the Bodleian (Add. MSS. D. 24).

p. 524, *after* last line *add*:

1702. *With a Preface. By Gilbert Burnet, now Lord Bishop of Sarum. The Fourth edition corrected: To which is added a Table.* London...Thomas Bever...1702. (2nd tract included.)

p. 535, *after* l. 13 *insert*:

1688. French trans., Amsterdam, Pierre Savouret.

after l. 36 *insert*:

1688. German trans. (Leipzig?), as Part II of *Some Letters* (q. v.).

p. 538, *after* l. 10 *add*:

The *Enquiry* was included in *A Second Collection of Papers relating to the present juncture of affairs in England*, of which the third edition appeared in 1689.

p. 557, *after* l. 20 *insert*:

1677. To a person unnamed. From my Study in Lincoln's Inne, the 9th of November, 1677. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23 ff. 97–8.
[On the Roman controversy.]

CORRIGENDA

While revising the Bibliography, the author of Part II discovered in the memorandum published by Blencowe and quoted on pp. 260–1, an indication of date which had been overlooked. This is given in the words "If the King goes away"; which show that the paper was written *certainly* before the King's second flight, *possibly* before his first. It becomes therefore necessary to make the following alterations in the text:

p. 258, after l. 33 *insert*:

"It is probable that we are conversant with some of his arguments. In a curious "undated memorandum found among the Sidney papers, and apparently belonging to "the interval we now consider he" (*and continue as from* p. 260 *last line to* p. 261, l. 18).

pp. 260–1. *Omit from* p. 260, l. 37, "his own opinion," *to* p. 261, l. 20, "eye. If so"; *inserting instead:*

"a change in his own opinion is observable. He had, at both periods, originally favoured "a compromise. The King's flight had in the present instance, altered the conditions; "and moreover"

p. 458, l. 19 *omit* "Portugal."

p. 460, l. 36 *before* "English" *insert* "some."

p. 557, ll. 9–11 and note:

This letter must be retransferred to the year 1673, as it gives Lauderdale the title of Duke, which he did not receive till May 1, 1672.

ERRATA

p. 147, l. 36, *for* "singular" *read* "singularly."

p. 154, l. 23, *for* "Hollis" *read* "Holles."

p. 335, ftn. l. 1, *for* "*Mortuis*" *read* "*Mortibus.*"

p. 376, l. 2, *for* "Assembly" *read* "Establishment."

p. 483, l. 25, *for* "forms" *read* "form."

p. 266, l, 19, note, *for* "Krämes" *read* "Krämer."

p. 286, l. 11, note, *for* "seems" *read* "seem."

p. 523, l. 3, *for* "Bishop" *read* "Archbishop."

p. 530, l. 3 *from bottom*, *for* "Improved by S." *read* "Revised and Improved by Thomas."

,, l. 2 *from bottom*, *after* "Revised" *add* "and improved."

INTRODUCTION.

BURNET AS A HISTORIAN.

BURNET has a place to himself in English historical literature, midway between the historians proper and the writers of memoirs. He belongs to both groups, for he attempted first to tell the story of a portion of the past from written records and afterwards to tell the story of the age in which he lived from his own reminiscences and the recollections of others. Posterity sets most value on Burnet as the narrator of contemporary history, but that should not make us forget that he began as a professional historian and that his own age rated him highest in that capacity. It is partly to Burnet's experience in writing the history of the past that the value of his memoirs of his own time is due. He had learnt to appreciate the relative importance of events by writing history as he had learned to appreciate and describe character by writing biography. His early writings possess an intrinsic value of their own, and an examination of their characteristics throws light on the character of his most lasting achievement, the *History of My Own Time*. For both reasons they deserve study.

Burnet's first historical work was the *Memoirs of the Lives and Actions of James and William Dukes of Hamilton*[1]. The book was rather a history of the times of the two dukes than their biographies. In the catalogue of books printed and published in Easter Term, 1678, it stands on the next page to an announcement of the fourth edition

[1] See pp. 98, 115, 150 *post*.

of Spottiswoode's *History of the Church and State of Scotland.* Originally it was designed to be a continuation of Spottiswoode's work, and it is said that the title-page of some copies of the first edition actually described it as the second volume of Spottiswoode. In the introduction prefixed to the *Lives* Burnet set forth at length his views on the function of the historian and the qualities which he should possess. Some histories, he said, were nothing but romances; full of great and palpable errors because their authors "lived out of business," and took too many things upon trust. Others were full of slanders and lies. There was "such foul dealing in the histories of our own time" that people had learnt to suspect histories of past times, and to regard all other writings of that nature as equally untrustworthy. In reality only two classes of historians deserved credit. First, those who had helped to make history. "Of all men those who have been themselves engaged in affairs are the fittest to write history, as knowing best how matters were designed and carried on." Secondly those who wrote with authentic documents at their disposal. "Those that have had the perusal of the cabinets of great "ministers, and of public records, are the best qualified for "giving the world a true information of affairs."

Burnet himself belonged to the second class. He had been given free access to the abundant and important correspondence of the first Duke of Hamilton—a correspondence which no previous English historian had seen, and one full of revelations about the policy of the late King and the origin of the civil troubles in England and Scotland. At first he intended merely to extract the information the letters contained and to summarise the results. Afterwards Sir Robert Moray persuaded him to adopt a different method. He "gave me," says Burnet, "such "reasons to change the whole work, and to insert most of "the papers at their full length, that prevailed on me to

"do it." The reason Burnet gives is that "the common "failings of historians have in this last age made people "desirous to see papers, records, and letters published at "their full length." The public in short wanted authentic documents instead of narrative of very dubious value, and the reception accorded to the first volume of Rushworth's *Collections*, published in 1659, had shown how thirsty people were to learn the truth about the late revolution. Dull though that book may seem to us now it was full of interest then, and to study it became an indisputable part of every gentleman's political education. Pepys, who bought a copy of the volume in November, 1663, read it with avidity. "So to my office writing letters," says his *Diary* under December 26, 1663, "and then to read and make "an end of Rushworth, which I did, and do say it is a book "the most worth reading for a man of my condition, or any "man that hopes to come to any publique condition in the "world, that I do know."

Burnet's book was welcomed for the same reason, but it was a great deal more than a mere collection of documents like Rushworth's: it was the first political biography of the modern type, combining a narrative of a man's life with a selection from his letters, so the novelty of the form added to the attractions of the matter.

Though the materials on which Burnet based his work made it infinitely superior to the productions of the "scribbling historians" he condemns in his preface, he did not exclusively rely on the Hamilton Papers. Where they failed him he sought and obtained information from Hamilton's officers, as for instance Sir James Turner, who contributed an account of the Preston campaign, and from other "persons of great worth and honour." Burnet also says that he owed some of his knowledge of the time to his father, whose conversations had given him "a great deal "more of the truth of these affairs than is generally known."

Accordingly the *Lives* of the Hamiltons at once became an authority, as indeed it deserved. Sir Robert Moray, charmed with the result of his advice, declared that he "did "not think there was a truer history writ since the apostles "days[1]." As it was originally written it was too true, or at least too frank. The long delay in the publication of the book was due to this. The dedication is dated 21 October, 1673, the warrant for a license 3 November, 1673, and the title-page 1677, but the book is not advertised in the *Term Catalogue* as published until Easter Term, 1678[2]. Political reasons, such as the quarrel between the third Duke of Hamilton and Lauderdale, no doubt contributed to hinder publication, for from November, 1673, Lauderdale became Burnet's enemy[3]. But there was much in the book which it must have seemed doubtful policy to print when the questions touched were so closely connected with existing political controversies.

Charles II was willing to admit a certain amount of freedom of speech. When Burnet represented that he would be obliged to show the faults of some of his father's ministers, the King said that "such things were unavoidable "in a history and therefore he allowed me to tell the truth "freely[4]." Charles read parts of the *Memoirs* himself, "particularly," says Burnet, "the account I give of the ill-"conduct of the bishops, that occasioned the beginning of "the wars; and told me that he was well pleased with it[5]." The King's ministers seem to have been less easy to satisfy, and the MS. of the *Memoirs* (now in the British Museum) shows signs of many insertions and many omissions[6]. Burnet

[1] *Own Time*, I. 27.

[2] Arber, *Term Catalogues*, I. 312; *Cal. State Papers Dom.* 1673–5, p. 4.

[3] p. 118 *post.* [4] Preface, p. 15. [5] *Own Time*, I. 356.

[6] Add. MS. 33, 259. See an article by Mr Robert Dewar entitled "Burnet on the Scottish Troubles" in the *Scottish Historical Review* for July, 1907, pp. 384–398. The preface is different to the printed one, and the MS. is imperfect, ending in July, 1647, i.e. on p. 404 of the edition of 1852 which contains 555 pages.

had, according to his own account, exercised considerable discretion and reticence. "Neither shall I tell," says a passage in the original preface, "how soon it was finished, nor with "what caution it was considered what things concerning "those times were fit to be published or what were to be "suppressed[1]." He confesses that he "did conceal several "things that related to the king," and "left out some "passages that were in his letters," because "in some of them "there was too much craft and anger[2]." Some of the passages in the manuscript were obviously omitted because they revealed the King's insincerity in his negotiations with the Covenanters in 1639. Other passages deleted referred to Lauderdale or Lauderdale's father. Some things Burnet had left out as injurious to the reputation of various noble houses, and when he came to relate the delivery of Charles I to the English in January, 1647, he again confessed that "in invidious passages I have spared the memories and "families of the unhappy actors[3]." It was also desirable not to go into the precise nature of the treaty which Charles I made with the Scottish commissioners at Carisbrooke in December, 1647, but it is doubtful whether Burnet knew the whole truth about that subject, since the details of the agreement were not revealed until the publication of the second volume of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* in 1703. For political reasons it was still more necessary to slur over the pledges which Charles II had made to the Scots in 1650 and 1651. No one would gather from the Memoirs of the Hamiltons that Charles the Second took the Covenant, and the brevity of the account of the events of those two years given in the life of the second Duke is no doubt due to considerations of this nature quite as much as to the scantiness of the papers relating to the period[4].

[1] *Scottish Historical Review*, IV. 398.
[2] See p. 99 *post*. [3] *Memoirs*, p. 397.
[4] Compare *Memoirs*, pp. 529, 537, and *Own Time*, I. 53, 110.

Finally there was the great difficulty that Burnet had undertaken to eulogise both Charles I and the first Duke of Hamilton, which made it necessary to handle very delicately the causes of the breach between the two, the Duke's imprisonment in 1643, and the King's distrust of the Duke even after their reconciliation in 1646[1].

Yet though Burnet suppressed some passages in the letters he published, and omitted some material facts, it is not just to charge him with dishonesty. For some of the suppressions and omissions the censorship to which his book was subjected is responsible; the reticence obligatory upon a man writing about such recent political events accounts for others. That he was biassed in favour of the royalist cause is evident, but he is much fairer than most writers of the period, and on the whole it must be said that he told as much of the truth as it was possible to publish at the time when he wrote.

Having learnt the difficulties which beset the writer of contemporary history Burnet had next to struggle with a new problem. In judging the *History of the Reformation* it is necessary to take into account the difficulties under which a 17th century historian laboured. He wrote before the British Museum existed, before the historical manuscripts in the Bodleian were catalogued, when the State Papers and the Public Records were in two separate repositories and both collections in a state of chaos. A historian who attempted to base his book on unprinted authorities met with obstacles of every kind. Fuller, who undertook a similar task to Burnet, describes his own experience thus. "A greater volume of general church "history might be made with less time, pains, and cost: for "in the making thereof, I had straw provided me to burn my

[1] The third Duke of Hamilton was evidently dissatisfied with the original draft of the *Memoirs*. He complained that it contained "great errors" and that Burnet was too precipitate in trying to publish it. Probably however he referred to the account of the Preston campaign. Turner's *Memoirs*, p. 254.

"brick; I mean could find what I needed in printed books. "Whereas in this *British Church History*, I must (as well "as I could) provide my own straw; and my pains have "been scattered all over the land, by riding, writing, going, "sending, chiding, begging, praying, and sometimes paying "too, to procure manuscript materials."

Burnet met with difficulties of a similar nature. He was allowed, he tells us, free access to the State Paper Office, by a warrant which the Earl of Sunderland procured of the King for him. "That office," he adds, "was first "set up by the Earl of Salisbury when he was Secretary of "State in King James's time; which though it is a copious "and certain repository for those that are to write our "history ever since the papers of state were laid up there, "yet for the former times it contains only such papers as "that great minister could then gather together; so that it "is not so complete in the transactions that fall within the "time of which I write[1]." Burnet procured some papers from that source, but the privilege of access was of little value so long as the documents it contained were unarranged. When he was preparing his third volume he visited the office again and found it "in much better order and "method than it was thirty years ago when I saw it last[2]." Much more serviceable to Burnet was the great collection of manuscripts in the Cotton Library, but there his difficulty was to get at them. The modern researcher, guaranteed by two respectable householders, obtains access to them at the British Museum without any trouble. But Sir John Cotton refused Burnet admission to his library unless he could obtain recommendations from the Archbishop of Canterbury and one of the Secretaries of State, and Archbishop Sancroft declined to interfere on Burnet's behalf. Burnet obtained admission through one of Cotton's relations, and copied hard for ten days till Cotton's return

[1] *Reformation*, II. 217. [2] *Reformation* III. 41.

to town again shut him out of the library. This was when the first volume was in preparation; after it was published and had met with universal applause no more difficulties were put in his way[1]. There were other manuscripts in other collections of which Burnet procured copies, all duly enumerated and traced in Pocock's admirable edition of his book[2]. In his own words, "I laid out for MSS. and "searched into all the offices." He even went so far as to publish an advertisement in the *London Gazette* asking people to lend him papers. "All persons that have any "papers concerning the Reformation of the Church of "England, or of any ministers of state or clergymen during "the reigns of King Edward the Sixth, Queen Mary, or "Queen Elizabeth, are most earnestly desired to give notice "of them to Mr Richard Chiswell, Bookseller, at the Rose "and Crown in St Paul's Churchyard, that they may be "perused by the author of the first part of that history "already extant in order to the completing of that necessary "work[3]."

These documents were not simply employed to serve as a basis for Burnet's narrative. Imitating the method he had already followed in his *Lives* of the Hamiltons he appended to each volume of his text a collection of "records," intended not only to justify his statements but to inform public opinion and to serve future historians. Hallam praises Burnet's book for this particular feature.

It "has the signal merit of having been the first in "England, as far as I remember, which is fortified by a large "appendix of documents. This though frequent in Latin, "had not been so usual in the modern languages[4]."

Unluckily Burnet's energy and zeal in searching for truth was not accompanied by equal care in stating it. He

[1] *Reformation*, III. 19. [2] *Reformation*, VII. 65–122.
[3] *London Gazette*, No. 1473, Jan. 1, 1679–80.
[4] *Literature of Europe*, IV. 369.

wrote in a hurry and his work swarms with inaccuracies of detail. On that point the testimony of his editor is emphatic and conclusive. "It is scarcely," writes Mr Pocock, "an exaggeration of the state of the case to say "that the author's dates are nearly as often wrong as right." In his quotation or summaries of other writers: "It is not "hastily to be taken for granted that he represents the sense "of the author from whom he copies, for such were his "inaccurate habits of thought, that where there is but a "slight alteration in the words, there will often be some "change in the sense. His strong prejudices again seem "in some cases to have led him unconsciously to alter the "sense of a passage to which he is referring." The papers he printed had been copied in haste, and by unskilled transcribers, and they were also carelessly printed. In the three volumes of documents selected for publication "after "making allowance for all the alterations in the spelling "both of common words and proper names, there remained "about ten thousand downright mistakes." Yet none of these shortcomings seem to this austere critic to justify the acrimony with which Burnet's enemies assaulted his honesty. Quoting a crucial instance Mr Pocock remarks: "There is "no reason whatever to accuse Burnet of wilfully mis-"representing this document, yet in point of fact it was "copied with so many mistakes, and so large an omission, "that it afforded a good handle for the accusation brought "against him, of having purposely falsified documents to "suit his purpose....Yet in truth nothing more is shown "by it, than to how great an extent an inaccurate and "prejudiced mind can be deceived into the belief that "certain facts make for its own view of a given case[1]."

One proof of Burnet's honesty was his willingness to own and correct his blunders. When he was printing his second volume a clergyman sent him a number of corrections

[1] *Reformation*, VII. 54, 55, 175.

to the first. These he published at the end of the second volume, "being neither ashamed to confess my faults, nor "unwilling to acknowledge from what hand I received better "information. My design in writing is to discover truth "and to deliver it down impartially to the next age; so I "should think it both a mean and criminal piece of vanity to "suppress this discovery of my errors[1]." What Burnet did in this case with Fulman's corrections he did later with those sent him by Baker and Strype.

The candour which this procedure shows is not common amongst historians, and is very much to Burnet's credit. He endeavoured to be equally candid in his general treatment of the subject, not to conceal the faults of the Reformers themselves and to state fairly the views of the different leaders and the conflicting parties. In this he was but partially successful, for he was neither impartial nor unprejudiced, and he wrote at a moment when popular feeling in England was vehemently excited against the Catholics, and shared himself the fears and passions of the time. Nevertheless, the author of the latest history of the Reformation finds it possible to praise his honesty in spite of the reservations he is forced to make about his accuracy. "No book," wrote Canon Dixon, "has been more severely criticised.... "For myself, I am far from joining in the unmeasured con- "demnation of this work which had been pronounced by some "writers of authority. It should be remembered that it was "the first work of the nature of a general history, founded on "authentic records, that appeared in this country. The "author was very laborious, and he studied to be exact. It "is true that he had strong prejudices, but who is free from "prejudice? The question is, whether his prejudices make "him dishonest. I do not think they do. He now and then "makes a downright blunder; but it is usually one of pure "prejudice, being often an unwarrantable inference from

[1] *Reformation*, II. 2.

"authorities fairly given; and he usually furnishes the "means of confuting himself. But he is never found giving, "to all appearances, the whole of a story and suppressing "everything that makes against his own view. He is never "found passing entirely over events that do not favour him[1]."

In judging an historical book on a great subject the design as well as the execution has to be taken into consideration. It is not merely accuracy in details and honesty we require, but some conception of the general significance of the events narrated and of their place in the world's history. Judged in this respect, Burnet's book was as much superior to the books of his predecessors, Fuller and Heylyn, as it was in knowledge and research. A recent writer does not hesitate to say that it marks the beginning of a new epoch in historical science and that Burnet's *History* raised the controversy it handled to a higher place of thought.

"It was the first attempt to write a judicial account of "the English Reformation from authentic sources. The "point of view is frankly Protestant; but Burnet has "sufficient breadth of mind and sufficient confidence in his "own case to be above the vulgar artifices of concealment "and misrepresentation. He approaches his subject in a "philosophic spirit. The Reformation was to his mind a "work of providence accomplished through human and im-"perfect agents. There were deadly errors to be rooted "out and priceless truths to be recovered from oblivion. "But the errors were only recognised by slow degrees; the "truth was long in dawning on the minds of Protestants. "Hence the fluctuations of opinion which delayed the pro-"gress of reform. Hence, too, the disagreements of reformed "communions on matters of speculation: there must be "differences when finite intellects are independently engaged "in the exploration of the infinite. But on all essentials the "Reformers were agreed; and this is sufficient to confirm

[1] Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, II. 359.

"our faith in human reason. There is a spiritual unity "among the Protestants which has more value because it is "more spontaneous and sincere than the formal unity of "Rome. Results, then, justify the Reformation. We need "not shrink from owning that its course was marked by "crimes and influenced by personal ambitions. The work "of Protestantism can neither be proved by vindicating nor "refuted by aspersing the characters of those who smoothed "the way for it. The highest ends of Providence are always "brought about through natural causes, often by the hands "of most unworthy agents. Good is educed from evil, "and many selfish wills are yoked together to fulfil a "purpose of which they are, at best, but half conscious.

"Burnet, in fact, is the exponent of a new historical "method. He is less concerned with persons than with the "genesis of new ideas in the turmoil of events. His vindica- "tion of reformed religion rests upon a contrast between the "system into which the earliest reformers were born and that "which was established as the consequence of their revolt[1]."

Possessing all these great merits—research, honesty, and breadth of view—it is not surprising that the minor defects of Burnet's book were overlooked, and that the *History of the Reformation* became at once a popular success. The House of Commons publicly thanked him for the service he had rendered to the Protestant religion. The book was read not only by scholars and politicians, but by men of the world. The most brilliant courtier and wit of the period, John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, solaced his illness by reading the book of the hour. "He had been entertaining himself," says Burnet, describing the origin of their acquaintance, "in "that his state of ill-health by reading the first part of the "*History of the Reformation*, with which he seemed not "ill pleased."

[1] "Gilbert Burnet," a lecture by H. W. C. Davis, in *Typical English Churchmen*, S.P.C.K., 1902, pp. 173–4.

About November, 1680, in the interval between the publication of the first and second volumes of the *History of the Reformation*, Burnet published *Some Passages of the Life and Death of the right honourable John Earl of Rochester*[1]. The little book deserves the praise which Johnson bestowed upon it[2]. Judged simply as literature, it is the finest thing Burnet ever wrote, and represents his style at its best. Historically, its value lies in the picture it gives us of the character and the ideas of a man who was at once a nobleman and a wit, and in the light it throws upon the life and thought of the time. As Miss Foxcroft points out, the dialogues between Burnet and Rochester are rendered with singular felicity, and they appear to be reproduced with singular fidelity, too. "As far as I can "remember," writes Burnet, "I have faithfully repeated the "substance of our arguments: I have not concealed the "strongest things he said to me, but though I have not "enlarged on all the excursions of his wit in setting them "off, yet I have given them their full strength as he ex- "pressed them, and, as far as I could recollect, have used "his own words." And, again: "I do not pretend to have "given the formal words he said, though I have done that "where I could remember them. I did not take notes of "our discourses last winter after we parted; so I may, "perhaps, in the setting out of my answers to him, have "enlarged more fully and more regularly than I could say "then in such free discourses as we had. I am not so sure "of all I set down as said by me, as I am of all said by him "to me. But yet the substance of the greatest part, even "of that, is the same[3]."

This account which Burnet gives us of his way of reporting Rochester's conversations is of particular interest. We see him learning the art and developing the method

[1] *Term Catalogue*, I. 417. [2] p. 166, *post*.
[3] *Some Passages*, pp. 124, 162.

which he practised later to so much purpose in the *History of My Own Time.*

A year later, in November, 1681, Burnet's *Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale* appeared[1]. To it he prefixed a short disquisition on the principles of biographical writing. No part of history, said he, was more instructive and delighting than the lives of great and worthy men, but to the general reader biographies of heroes and princes were on the whole more entertaining than useful. Not only were their authors often too biassed by interest or resentment to write the truth, but even when such biographies were truthfully written they were lacking in instructiveness. The lives of private men were more profitable. They set before the eyes of the average man "things that are more "imitable"; they showed him wisdom and virtue "in such "plain and familiar instances as do direct him better and "persuade him more." Burnet's design in writing was, he tells us, "to propose a pattern of heroic virtue" to the world in general, and to lawyers in particular, a life which they might take as a model, as Hale himself was said to have taken the life of Pomponius Atticus by Cornelius Nepos.

One great disadvantage Burnet laboured under. He had not known Hale personally, though he had often observed him amongst the congregation in the Rolls chapel. "In my life I never saw so much gravity tempered "with that sweetness, and set off with so much vivacity as "appeared in his looks and behaviour, which disposed me to "a veneration for him, which I never had for any with whom "I was not acquainted."

He had, however, help from men whose acquaintance with Hale was intimate and of long standing. Robert Gibbon, of the Middle Temple, one of Hale's executors, and apparently for a long time one of his clerks, supplied Burnet with memorials and reminiscences. "One of the greatest

[1] *Term Catalogues*, I. 461.

"men of the Law," perhaps Heneage Finch, furnished an abstract of the character of Hale, based upon long observation and much converse with him. This information Burnet employed with much skill and tact, producing a life-like portrait of the great lawyer. The book was plainly and simply written, for its object was to set Hale out "in the "same simplicity in which he lived." Dates are few, and some important biographical facts are not very exactly stated. Yet compared with Sprat's account of Cowley, which passed then as a model biography, Burnet's life is a model, for Sprat gives as few facts as possible and drowns them all in a flood of elegant verbiage. Burnet's object was not so much to relate a career as to describe a man, and he succeeds in bringing out the salient points of Hale's character with great distinctness. Little traits, such as the carelessness of Hale about his dress, his care for old horses and dogs, his scrupulousness about bad money and similar characteristics, give life and reality to the portrait, and are just the things which most contemporary biographers would have omitted as too trivial to mention. Contemporaries generally accepted it as a good portrait. Roger North criticises it, alleging that Hale was timid and too fond of popularity, vain and too open to flattery, and rather scoffs at the scientific and theological attainments of the judge, though admitting that he was "an "incomparable magistrate" and "a most excellent person." For the book and its author he had nothing but condemnation. "Gilbert Burnet," he said, "has pretended to "write his life, but wanted both information and under-"standing for such an undertaking. Nay, that which he "intended chiefly, to touch the people with a panegyric, he "was not fit for, because he knew not the virtues he had fit "to be praised, and I should recommend to him the lives of "Jack Cade, Wat Tyler, or Cromwell, as characters fitter for "his learning and pen to work upon than him[1]."

[1] *Lives of the Norths*, ed. Jessopp, III. 102.

Roger North little knew when he wrote this that Burnet had devoted his pen to Cromwell. He began writing his memoirs about August, 1683, a few months after the publication of the life of Hale, and it was about 1687 that he wrote the sketch of Cromwell which, in an enlarged form, occupies so many pages of his greatest work[1].

Burnet's *History of My Own Time* was the work of many years. Both volumes appeared posthumously, one in 1724, the other in 1734, but the original narrative had been revised throughout and to a great extent rewritten. "I begun to write in the year 1683. I continued in the year "1684, and ended it in the year 1686, and have now writ it "all over again and ended it in August 1703, and revised it "in March, 1711[2]." This is Burnet's account of the composition of the section narrating the reign of Charles II, and other parts of his work went through a similar process. We have therefore in the *History of My Own Time* something different from most autobiographical memoirs. Such memoirs are generally written at the end of a man's career, looking back over a long period of years when memory is apt to confuse the outline of the landscape, and fancy to alter somewhat its colours. But in the case of Burnet the *History* is based upon a series of impressions written down soon after the events recorded, and sometimes almost at the moment when they happened. For instance, although the portion of the *History* dealing with the reign of James II did not take its present form till much later, it is throughout founded on a strictly contemporaneous narrative, and is therefore of higher authority than the portion relating to the reign of Charles II, which is only in part based on such evidence.

In estimating the value of Burnet's statements we have the further advantage that much of the original narrative is

[1] *Supplement*, pp. 229–242; *Own Time*, I. 65–83.
[2] *Own Time*, I. 615.

still in existence. Thanks to Miss Foxcroft the portions which survive have been printed and admirably edited in a *Supplement to Burnet's History of My Own Time* (Clarendon Press, 1902), so that a comparison of the two versions is easy. For Charles the Second's reign we have only a long fragment covering the period 1660 to 1664,and some smaller fragments relating to the years 1679–1683. For the fifteen years from 1664 to 1679 there is a great gap in the MS. We have the whole of the first version of the reign of James II and three quarters of the reign of William III, that is, from October, 1684, just before the death of Charles II, to January 1696, just before the treaty of Ryswick. From January, 1696, to August, 1708, the original version is again missing, but for the period from 1708 to 1713 it has been preserved.

It is possible therefore to compare Burnet's earlier impressions with his later ones, to trace the development of his political views as they were affected by alterations in his own position and changes in English politics, and to see how the *History of My Own Time* gradually assumed its present shape.

Ranke, who was the first to attempt to compare the two versions, thinks the earlier one more vigorous and more clear, the characters fresher and truer to life; "persons and "events," he says, "appear more as they are," and he concludes by speaking of Burnet as "ruining his own work." Politically he describes the later version as intentionally more Whiggish in tone, more hostile to the Tories and to the clergy. Nottingham being a Tory is treated more harshly in the second version than the first, Marlborough being a Whig leader, more indulgently[1]. It was natural however that Burnet should revise his earlier estimates of public men by the light of their subsequent careers, and that time should alter his opinions on measures as well as men. Though it is always necessary to compare Burnet's earlier

[1] Ranke, *History of England*, VI. 73–77.

with his later view, there is nothing discreditable to him in the fact that he made such changes, and it does not diminish the value of his *History*.

The nature of the changes which Burnet made is pointed out by Miss Foxcroft in this biography[1], and they are set forth at length and in detail in the introduction to her *Supplement* to Burnet[2]. Some alterations were made in self-defence. Burnet suppressed for instance some indications of his early intimacy with Lauderdale, and concealed the radical nature of the difference between his earlier and later views on the question of passive obedience[3]. Many other alterations were merely the natural consequence of the complete change in the scheme of the work which Burnet made in 1703 when he began to recast the whole work. In the original sketch the life of the author formed the thread by which the various episodes were connected, but he finally resolved to convert his autobiographical memoirs into a formal history. Clarendon in exactly the same way turned his life of himself into the *History of the Rebellion*, and in each case the result was the omission of a number of passages relating to the author himself. Burnet's abandonment of his original design "destroyed to a great "extent the unity of the work" and made his narrative less coherent and less orderly. Clarendon's change of plan, for various reasons, was not so detrimental in its literary results as Burnet's, but it also led to much disorder and many repetitions[4].

From the moment when he began to write Burnet had in view the ultimate publication of his memoirs. "I must "begin," he wrote in 1683, "with a character of the King and "Duke, but I must give them at present very imperfect, "otherwise what I write may happen to be seized upon, and

[1] See pp. 403–4 *post*.

[2] *Supplement*, pp. xvi–xxi.

[3] *Supplement*, p. 515.

[4] See articles on Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, in the *English Historical Review*, XIX. 26, 246, 464.

"I know not what may be made of that; but I will venture "a good deal now, and if ever I outlive them I will say the "rest when it will be more safe." In 1687 Burnet told the Earl of Middleton that if the prosecution against him in Scotland was not dropped he would be driven to print "an apology for myself, in which I will be forced to make "a recital of all that share I have had in affairs these "twenty years past; and in which I must mention a vast "number of particulars which I am afraid will be displeasing "to his Majesty." Again, in October, 1688, when he was on the point of embarking for England with William of Orange, Burnet left instructions, in case of his death, for the printing of what he then termed "my secret *History*[1]."

The phrase is suggestive. In the preface to his *Life* of Hale, Burnet regretted that most biographers who wrote about heroes and princes did not or could not tell the whole truth. "Few have been able to imitate the pattern Suetonius "set the world, in writing the lives of the Roman emperors "with the same freedom that they led them." Apparently Burnet wished to write the life of Charles II with similar frankness, and the famous comparison of that sovereign to Tiberius[2] seems to show that he had been reading Suetonius when he wrote it.

In the final version, however, Burnet had a different model before him. He was familiar with the best modern historians. In his *History of the Reformation* he had taken Paolo Sarpi as an example for imitation. Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent* he described as "writ with as much life "and beauty, and authority as had ever been seen in any "human writing," and he styled it "that noble pattern "which the famous Venetian friar has given to all writers of "ecclesiastical history[3]."

[1] *Supplement*, pp. 47, 526; *A Collection of Eighteen Papers*, 1689, p. 149.
[2] *Own Time*, I. 614.
[3] *History of the Reformation*, ed. Pocock, I. 581; II. 355; III. 10.

Now Burnet copied De Thou[1]. "I have made him," he writes at the beginning of his autobiography, "my pattern "in writing, and as I read most of him many years ago, and "formed my design in writing from that great original; so "after I had ended my *History* I read him over again, to "see how far I had risen up in my imitation of him, and "was not a little pleased to find that, if I did not flatter "myself too much, I had in some degree answered my "design in resembling him[2]." It was also the example of De Thou which suggested to Burnet the idea of supplementing the *History* by adding to it as an appendix a short life of himself. In the *History of My Own Time*, however, Burnet diverged in several points from his original. "I "have avoided," says he, "a particular recital of warlike "actions both in battles and sieges." Marshal Schomberg had advised him "not to meddle in the relation of military "matters," on the ground that civilian writers usually committed great blunders when they did so[3]. Laying this advice to heart he declined to enter into the particulars either of the battle of Sedgemoor or that of the Boyne, and contented himself with stating the results.

In the same way Burnet informs us that he did not endeavour to be as copious as De Thou in the relation of foreign affairs. Although in dealing with the wars of William the Third's and Anne's reigns he felt obliged to give a tolerably full account of European events during each year, it is evident that his knowledge of them was slight and mainly derived from newspapers. Ranke justly observes that "of a comprehension of the state of affairs in the world at "large, such as Thuanus attempted, there is in Burnet "scarcely the faintest trace. He keeps to the province of "Scottish and English affairs, with which he unites those of

[1] Historiarum sui Temporis Libri cxxxviii ab anno 1543 usque ad annum 1607; accedunt ejusdem de vita sua commentariorum Libri sex.

[2] *Supplement*, p. 451. [3] *Own Time*, I. 49; cf. *Supplement*, p. 165.

"Holland and France, but only so far as they affect the "former, and as they came to his knowledge by staying in "those countries[1]."

Burnet again diverged from his model in saying very little about "the lives and writing of learned men." The literature of the fifty years of English history with which he deals is passed over, and his references to the few great writers of the period he does mention are of the briefest character. Hobbes is mentioned as the author of "a very wicked book "with a very strange title," and there a are few sentences setting forth the evil principles it inculcated, and their effect in corrupting his contemporaries. Locke is never mentioned at all, and though Hoadley is praised for his confutation of Filmer's *Patriarcha*, there is no reference to the more effective answer contained in Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*. Of the poets Dryden is named as a dramatist only, as the man who above all others debased the stage and demoralised the public. He is stigmatised as "the great master at dramatic poesy" who was "a monster "of immodesty and of impurity of all sorts." Marvell's name could hardly be omitted on account of his controversy with Parker; he is styled "the liveliest droll of the age, "who writ in a burlesque strain but with so peculiar and "so entertaining a conduct, that from the king down to the "tradesman his book was read with great pleasure[2]."

Nobody would gather from these allusions that Dryden wrote anything besides plays, or Marvell anything but prose. The only sign of any appreciation of poetry on the part of Burnet is his praise of *Paradise Lost*. After relating Milton's escape at the Restoration the Bishop says that Milton lived many years afterwards, "much visited by all "strangers and much admired by all at home for the poems "he writ, though he was then blind, chiefly that of *Paradise*

[1] Ranke, *History of England*, VI. 49.
[2] *Own Time*, I. 187, 260, 269.

"*Lost*, in which there is a nobleness both of contrivance and "execution, that though he affected to write in blank verse "without rithm, and made many new and rough words, yet "it was the beautifulest and perfectest poem that ever was "writ, at least in our language[1]."

On the other hand, though Burnet was indifferent to the literature of the time in which he lived, or rather to *belles lettres* in general, he devotes a considerable space to the Royal Society and incidentally to the scientific movement of the age. At one time he dabbled in science himself: "I run through some courses of chemistry which helped "me in my philosophical notions." At another he began to study mathematics, and found the subject enthralling. "I was much taken with them and I had such a memory "that I could carry on a progress of equations long without "pen, ink, or paper, so that I was pursued with them day "and night[2]." These things, however, were but diversions. The fulness with which theological and ecclesiastical controversies are treated in his pages and the space devoted to the different schools of religious thought and the characters of the great churchmen show plainly what Burnet's real interests were. For him the great event of the time in the intellectual sphere was the rise of that "new set of men" in the church of the Restoration upon whom "men of narrower "thoughts and fiercer temper" afterwards "fastened the "name of Latitudinarians." He explained their position; he set forth their aims and their hopes; he traced their influence on church and state; that is his contribution to the history of English thought in the seventeenth century[3].

The aim with which Burnet wrote his *History*, or rather recast his autobiographical memoirs as a history, is several times explained in his pages. "My chief design in "writing was to give a true view of men and of counsels "leaving public transactions to gazettes and the public

[1] *Own Time*, I. 163. [2] *Supplement*, pp. 469, 489. [3] *Own Time*, I. 186–191.

"historians of the times[1]." In another passage he insists still more strongly on the moral purpose which inspired him. "My intention in writing was not so much to tell a "fine tale to the world, and to amuse them with a discovery "of many secrets, and of intrigues of state, to blast the memory "of some and to exalt others, to disgrace one party and to "recommend another: my chief design was better formed "and deeper laid: it was to give such a discovery of errors "in government, and of the excesses and follies of parties, "as may make the next age wiser by what I tell them "of the last[2]." He seems to have thought that it would serve to guide the governing classes. It would undeceive he suggests, the "good and well-meaning" section of the clergy, and "deliver them from common prejudices and "mistaken notions" about public affairs[3]. It would help to educate the English gentry, who were worse instructed in England than in any other country with which Burnet was acquainted. He held that the study of history should be a necessary part of their training in order to make them better qualified to take part in the government of their country and more attached to its constitution. They should study it, not in abridgments, "but in the fullest "and most copious collections of it, that they may see to "the bottom what is our constitution, and what are our "laws, what are the methods bad princes have taken to "enslave us, and by what conduct we have been preserved[4]."

In the last lines Burnet seems to be referring to his own *History*. But the drawback was that when the *History* appeared its veracity and its value were at once disputed. Many people denied that it was history. On November 15, 1723, Dr Stratford wrote to the Earl of Oxford that he had just been reading "Gibby Burnet's *History*[5]." It was "a

[1] *Own Time*, Preface.
[2] *Own Time*, II. 633.
[3] *Own Time*, Preface.
[4] *Own Time*, II. 649.
[5] *MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, VII. 367.

"strange rhapsody of chit-chat and lies, ill tacked together." In many things it was plain that the author was very ignorant, and much that he could have given an account of he had purposely omitted. About the same time John Potenger, in his advice to his grandson on going to the University warned him against reading Burnet. "Be "careful of what history you read of late reigns, for it is "full of legend and false secret tradition, especially Burnet's, "which is no more to be credited than *The Seven Champions "of Christendom*, and if you will believe me, you will never "be imposed on by that fallacious historian, who

"Peccare docentes
"Fallax historia monet:—

"for generally what he says comes short of truth, or tells it "with a bad design. His characters for the most part are "not according to the merits of the persons, but as they "pleased or displeased him. This Scotch prelate, a mere "father-in-law to our church, was in his nature so fiery a "*boute-feu*, that he was not contented to disturb the peace "of the church or state in all king's reigns whilst he lived, "but has left a posthumous piece of history to seduce "posterity, and to disquiet the nation when he is in his "grave[1]."

Bolingbroke classed Burnet with party pamphleteers. "Even pamphlets, written on different sides and on different "occasions in our party disputes, and histories of no more "authority than pamphlets, will help you to come at truth. "Read them with suspicion, for they deserve to be "suspected; pay no regard to the epithets given nor to "the judgments passed; neglect all declamation, weigh the "reasoning, and advert to fact. With such precautions, "even Burnet's history may be of some use[2]."

Other critics complained that Burnet misrepresented

[1] *Private Memoirs of John Potenger*, 1841, p. 5, ed. C. W. Bingham.
[2] Bolingbroke's *Letters on the Study of History*, ed. 1870, p. 136.

events in order to exaggerate his own importance. Lord Hervey prefaces his own memoirs with a disclaimer directed against his predecessors. "I leave these ecclesiastical "heroes of their own romances—De Retz and Burnet—to "aim at that useless imaginary glory of being thought to "influence every considerable event they relate, and I very "freely declare that my part in this drama was only that of "the Chorus's in the ancient plays, who by constantly "being on the stage saw everything that was done, and "made their own comments upon the scene, without "mixing in the action or making any considerable figure "in the performance[1]."

Nevertheless even Burnet's contemporary opponents could not deny that in spite of prejudice and exaggeration there was much of value in the volumes they denounced. "Damn him," Atterbury is reported to have said, "he "has told a great deal of truth, but where the devil did he "learn it[2]?"

What discredited Burnet was his lack of discrimination: truth and legend were mixed together, and the better metal was alloyed with too much dross. He had "a "prodigious memory and a very indifferent judgment," explained Lord Dartmouth. "He was extremely partial, "and readily took everything for granted that he heard to "the prejudice of those he did not like; which made him "pass for a man of less truth than he really was. I do not "think he designedly published anything he believed "to be false." Afterwards Dartmouth retracted this last sentence, and declared that the Bishop published many things he must have known to be untrue, but his earlier verdict was the correct one[3]. It exactly agrees with the later verdict of Dr Johnson. "I do not believe" said that

[1] Lord Hervey, *Memoirs*, ed. 1884, I. 3.
[2] Cole's MS. quoted in Bohn's *Lowndes*, I. 320.
[3] *Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. xxxiii.; cf. vol. IV. p. I, ed. 1836.

sagacious critic, "that Burnet intentionally lied; but he "was so much prejudiced that he took no pains to find out "the truth. He was like a man who resolves to regulate "his time by a certain watch; but will not enquire whether "the watch is right or wrong[1]."

The capital instance of this prejudice is Burnet's treatment of the question of the birth of the Prince of Wales. Convinced by the rumours from England that James II and his Queen intended to palm off a supposititious child on the nation, he became so firmly imbued with the theory of fraud that he was incapable of judging the evidence when it was submitted to him[2]. Other legends too, especially if they told against political opponents, he adopted with similar credulousness.

This uncritical habit of mind much diminishes the value of the *History of My Own Time*, since a very large portion of it rests on hearsay evidence. Usually he gives an authority for each of his stories. This fact he learnt from Lauderdale, that from Primrose, or Leighton, or Essex, or Schomberg, or Titus. Something he was told by Lord Holles, much he had heard from old Sir Harbottle Grimstone, and a good deal from Lord Montagu and Colonel Stouppe. But he did not sufficiently sift the information he gathered from these various resources and allowed mere gossip not only too large a place in his narrative but too great an influence on his judgments of men and events.

Nevertheless he had the inestimable advantage of personal acquaintance with the chief men of his times. "For "above thirty years" he asserted, "I have lived in such "intimacy with all who have had the chief conduct of affairs, "and have been so much trusted, and on so many important "occasions employed by them, that I have been able to "penetrate far into the true secrets of counsels and designs[3]."

[1] Boswell's *Johnson*, ed. Hill, II. 213. [2] See *post*, pp. 238, 240, 253.
[3] *Own Time*, Preface.

The ambition of playing a part in "intrigues of state "and the conduct of public affairs" had for many years attracted him, and it was only in the latter years of his life that it had ceased to do so. "I was for some years deeply "immersed in these, but still with hopes of reforming the "world, and of making mankind wiser and better; but I have "found that which is crooked cannot be made straight[1]."

Burnet's career had really enabled him to know a great deal about the political history of his time, and his character had led him always to seek for such knowledge with singular pertinacity. Atterbury's surprise that he knew so much was unreasonable. No doubt Burnet as Hervey implies exaggerated his own influence and importance, but what he writes about affairs in which he was personally employed and matters which came directly under his observation is always trustworthy. His account of affairs in Scotland between the Restoration and the year 1673 has been subjected to minute examination in Dr Osmund Airy's edition of the *History*, and bears the test of comparison with contemporary documents extremely well. Equally valuable in a different way are Burnet's accounts of English politics immediately after the Revolution, and of his earlier intercourse with William and Mary when he was an exile at the Hague.

Bearing in mind the distinction between the parts which rest on personal knowledge and those which depend on secondary evidence, it is not difficult to determine the value of particular statements contained in the *History*, especially since for a large portion of it we have the advantage of being able to compare the earlier and later versions. After all necessary deductions have been made, it remains an authority of mixed quality it is true, but of primary importance. Put the whole mass into the crucible, and eliminate the inferior elements; the amount of true and valuable

[1] *Own Time*, II. 669.

information left represents a high percentage. Burnet bears the test of comparison with the writers of memoirs very well.

A comparison between Burnet and Clarendon naturally suggests itself. The *History of the Rebellion* appeared in 1702–4. It very probably suggested to Burnet, as Miss Foxcroft thinks, the idea of converting his autobiographical narrative into a formal history. There was some resemblance in the position of the two authors. Each wrote of men he had known and of events in which he had taken part. Each was prejudiced and partial, honest in intention but holding a brief for a particular party. But Clarendon played a far greater part on the political stage than Burnet, and wrote from a larger knowledge of affairs and a more intimate acquaintance with the problems of government. He was throughout nearer to the centre of things than Burnet. Part of his *History* is of first-rate value, part of very slight value. Some portions of it and those the most trustworthy are based on documentary evidence: some on recent, others on distant recollections. When Clarendon depends on memory alone he is much less trustworthy than Burnet, whose memory was at once more exact and more retentive.

But the difference between the character of the two historians is more striking than the resemblance which exists between the substance of their works. It reveals itself in every word they write. Clarendon is always dignified; he has a large vocabulary and a great choice of words. Burnet is vulgar and familiar as well as occasionally elevated; he has no great choice of words, and repeats some of his phrases far too often. Clarendon's constructions are sometimes involved, but Burnet's relatives and antecedents are frequently so mixed that it is difficult to determine what person is meant by some particular "he" or "who." Swift is never tired of commenting on the

inelegancy of Burnet's expressions or the awkward construction of his sentences. "I never read so ill a style" is his verdict. He condemns it as "rough, full of improprieties, "in expressions often Scotch, and often such as are used "by the meanest people." When Burnet observes that *Paradise Lost* is the perfectest poem ever written, "at "least in our language," Swift comments "a mistake, for it "is *in English*[1]."

There is a great difference also between the long, sonorous, rolling periods of Clarendon, which seem a last echo of the Elizabethans in our literature, and the short disconnected sentences of Burnet. As we read what Swift calls his "jumping periods" we seem embarked on a rough choppy sea, as it might be the Channel passage.

On the other hand when we get beyond the style and come to the matter there is a realism in Burnet which one misses in Clarendon. Clarendon is a little overpowered by literary conventions: the dignity of history is always with him: a long row of great historians, Roman or Italian, are before his eyes: we feel that he is consciously seeking to rival them, to reproduce their effects and to follow their rules. Certain facts must only be mentioned in the most roundabout fashion. When Clarendon has to speak of Lady Castlemaine he introduces her thus: "There was a "lady of youth and beauty with whom the King had lived "in great and notorious familiarity from the time of his "coming into England," and he never refers to her by name but always calls her vaguely "the Lady." Burnet on the other hand bluntly describes her as "the King's first "and longest mistress," and mentions not only her name but those of many other ladies of the same kind. It was not merely that the literary taste of Burnet's generation differed from that of Clarendon's; Burnet preferred a straightforward phrase and had none of Clarendon's

[1] Swift's *Works*, vol. x. pp. 327, 336, ed. Temple Scott.

reticence. If one of his *dramatis personae* had used a broad jest or an indecent proverb to point an argument he did not hesitate to insert it in relating the incident.

Clarendon and Burnet have a totally different way of telling the anecdotes with which they illustrate the character of the times or of the men they describe. Clarendon tells a story in a large, leisurely, oratorical manner, making almost a small epic or a little drama out of it. See for instance the stories of the ghost of Sir George Villiers and of the King's attempt to borrow money from Lords Deincourt and Kingston[1]. Burnet's stories are little bits of gossip that drop naturally from his pen, with a sort of artless garrulity, as they used to do from his tongue; he seems to tell them not so much to produce an effect, but because having heard or seen something of interest he cannot keep it to himself. His writing has all the qualities of his conversation which, if report can be trusted, was as full of historical scandal as his book. "He hath told me many "passages not mentioned in this *History*," says Swift[2].

For though Burnet had liberal ideas as to what might be published there were a few things which he thought it desirable not to print. White Kennet records a story which Burnet told in order to prove the principle that it was not expedient to publish everything that was true. "Is this story now fit to be told?" he asked his hearers, after he had related it. "All the company stood amazed "and held up their hands," thus agreeing that it was not[3]. A still more amazing story recorded in Spence's *Anecdotes* on the authority of the Dean of Winchester, is omitted here in deference to the principle just laid down[4].

As a narrator on a large scale Clarendon is much

[1] *Rebellion*, I. 89–94; 59–60. [2] Swift, *Works*, X. 329.

[3] Birch, *Enquiry in the share which King Charles I had in the Transactions of the Earl of Glamorgan*, 2nd edition, 1756, p. 372.

[4] Spence's *Anecdotes*, ed. Singer, p. 329.

superior to Burnet; his account of the progress of a movement or the development of a situation is more coherent and more clear. But in telling an anecdote, or describing a scene or an interview Burnet frequently excels him. When Clarendon reports a conversation the personages all speak in much the same style, in the Clarendonian dialect in short. As Goldsmith said of Johnson, his little fishes talk like whales. Burnet on the other hand tries to give the *ipsissima verba* of the persons with whom he conversed. Even in an abridged form they talk naturally and in their proper character. There is more individuality and more life in Burnet's conversations. His pages give a much truer idea of what Charles the Second's talk was like than those which Clarendon in his account of his administration devotes to the same subject, and yet Clarendon knew Charles much better than Burnet and had spent many years in close association with the King.

Burnet's characters on the other hand are admittedly inferior to Clarendon's. Swift says, "His characters are "miserably wrought, in many things mistaken, and all of "them detracting except of those who were friends to the "Presbyterians." To a certain extent the criticism is true: they are rough and unfinished; often they are merely a bundle of characteristics and comments bound together anyhow. In Dryden's phrase, "he faggoted his notions as "they fell." Hence he often provides materials for a portrait painter rather than a picture. He had more observation than insight. When he notes a trait which he observed or records the impression which some person produced upon him his evidence is of the greatest value. Hence the superiority of the first characters of Charles II and his ministers contained in Burnet's original manuscript to those embodied in the published *History*. As Ranke remarks they "have internal truth and give proof of his power of "comprehending human nature." They are more vivid and

vigorous, too, for they represent his first impressions, unalloyed by late accretions of prejudice or legend, and unsophisticated by attempts to polish his style.

One distinction between Burnet's characters and Clarendon's is that the former notices a number of minor particulars of every kind which Clarendon neglects or disdains. Clarendon's description of the exterior of the personages he mentions is usually vague. He tells you that Sir Harry Vane had "had an unusual aspect" which "made men think "there was somewhat in him of extraordinary," but does not explain what the peculiarity in Vane's look was. He mentions that Oliver St John "naturally had a great cloud "in his face" simply in order to explain the significance of his smile at a particular political crisis, and that Lauderdale's tongue was too big for his mouth in order to heighten a description of the effectiveness of one of his speeches[1]. Burnet piles details on details. Take his description of Lauderdale. "It may be expected I should be a little "copious in setting out his character for I knew him very "particularly. He made a very ill appearance; he was very "big; his hair was red, hanging oddly about him: his tongue "was too big for his mouth which made him bedew all that "he talked to; and his whole manner was rough and "boisterous, and very unfit for a court[2]." Burnet enumerates moral features in the same fashion as physical, pouring forth, with hardly any attempt at selection or arrangement, a number of traits and reminiscences, and leaving his readers to construct a character from a catalogue of characteristics.

Clarendon's characters on the other hand are works of art. He selects and arranges the particular traits he thinks most significant as indications or illustrations of character. Instead of individualising his personages by noting the little peculiarities which differentiated them from other men he

[1] Clarendon, *Rebellion*, II. 78, III. 34; *Continuation of Life*, 105.
[2] *Own Time*, I. 101.

seems to endeavour to generalise, and to reduce them all to certain universal types.

In reading the *History of the Rebellion* one is continually reminded of the fact that the description of imaginary types of character was a popular literary exercise in Clarendon's day. Burnet's rough sketches, inferior though they may be as artistic compositions, have an individuality which Clarendon's finished portraits sometimes lack. But as a rule he is more convincing when he gives a glimpse of a character rather than a full length picture, and sometimes hits in a sentence what he misses in a paragraph. He rises highest when he writes from his heart, as in his account of Archbishop Leighton. "I bear still," he says, "the greatest admiration for the memory of that man than "I do to any person," and the sincerity of this feeling inspires and elevates the pages he devotes to the representation of his friend.

In the latter half of the *History of My Own Time* William and Mary are the central figures. Burnet's narrative makes a fresh start when they come upon the stage, and flags after they leave it. We owe much to the chance which brought his wandering steps to the Hague in 1686, and so associated him with the Prince in his expedition to England. Anecdotes, impressions, and records of conversation acquire a double value when they reveal to us one of the greatest men of the age at the crisis of his career, and light up one of the turning points in English history. Burnet draws both William and Mary with convincing truthfulness. Of the two he understood Mary better. For her he cherished a feeling which was a mixture of affection, loyalty, and admiration. "I never admired any as I "admired her" he declared in the *History*, and the fervid *Essay on the Memory of the Late Queen* should be read side by side with the briefer and better known commemoration in his account of the reign of William and Mary. For William, Burnet's attachment was political rather than

personal; changes in the situation of English politics, in the policy of the King, and in the relations of the bishop and his master influenced Burnet's judgment as an historian. The character of William which Burnet wrote in 1686 is far more favourable than that written in 1702, but the main features are the same, and the final estimate if less enthusiastic is just and acute. For however they differed William remained throughout in Burnet's eyes "a glorious "instrument raised up by God" to redeem the civil and religious liberties of Englishmen, though he became more sensible of the imperfections of the instrument, and more critical.

This question of characterisation is more important than it seems. The great difference between historical writers of the 17th century and those of our own day lies in their varying conceptions of the relative importance of personal and general causes. Clarendon, for instance, has hardly any conception of the working of general causes in history. He mentions indeed the "immediate finger "and wrath of God" as one of the causes of the revolutions he undertakes to relate, and vaguely alludes to "the natural causes and means which have usually attended "kingdoms swollen with long plenty, pride, and excess." These, however, are but formal and perfunctory prefaces; as soon as he gets to work on the story of events he attributes everything to the action of particular persons. For him to know the chief actors is to know the causes of things, and he seeks to make them known in order that his readers may see "the pride of this man, the popularity of "that, the levity of one, the morosity of another, the spirit of "craft and subtlety in some and the rude and unpolished "integrity of others...like so many atoms contributing jointly "to this mass of confusion[1]." Motives which influenced masses of men escape his appreciation, and the *History of the Rebellion* is accordingly an account of the Puritan

[1] *History of the Rebellion*, I. 2, 4.

Revolution which is unintelligible because the part played by Puritanism is misunderstood or omitted altogether.

Burnet's task like Clarendon's was to write the history of a political revolution which was mainly due to religious causes, and he was better qualified for it than Clarendon because he understood better the significance of the questions at issue. Wider theological sympathies, a natural breadth of view, and the character of his historical studies enabled him to appreciate the standpoint of different sections of Protestants, to realise the difficulties with which English statesmen had to deal, and to perceive their solution. He succeeds in making the Revolution of 1688 intelligible while Clarendon leaves that of 1649 unexplained.

At the same time Burnet's conception of general causes is consistently theological. It was very clear to him that the course of events was providentially ordered, and that it was part of the business of an historian to vindicate the ways of God to man. In the events of 1688 he saw plain evidence of divine intervention. One proof was the little damage which William's fleet suffered when it was driven back at first setting out. This was "a mark of God's great care "of us, who though he had not changed the course of the "winds and the seas in our favour, yet had preserved us "while we were in such apparent danger beyond what "could have been imagined." So too when "a Protestant "wind" facilitated the prosperous passage of William's fleet, kept that of James' in harbour, and then shifting to the west frustrated pursuit, Burnet says "I never found a disposition "to superstition in my temper: I was rather inclined to be "philosophical upon all occasions. Yet I must confess, that "this strange ordering of the winds and seasons, just to "change as our affairs required it, could not but make deep "impressions upon me, as well as on all that observed it." Later still, in the wars which followed the Revolution, Burnet commented on the recurrence of similar phenomena.

A sudden fog preserved a fleet of British merchantmen from French cruisers, an unusually dry autumn facilitated Marlborough's sieges, and so on. "I know," he comments, "that it is not possible to determine when such accidents "rise from a chain of second causes in the course of nature, "and when they are directed by a special providence: but "my mind has always carried me so strongly to acknowledge "the latter that I love to set these reflections in the way of "others, that they may consider them with the same serious "attention that I feel in myself[1]."

A larger survey of the past seemed to furnish ground for Burnet's faith. What struck him when he looked back on the history of Europe since the Reformation was the progress of the Protestant religion and the vicissitudes through which it had passed. Five times in the course of the last two centuries European Protestantism had been in great peril, almost, it seemed to him, in danger of extinction; yet at each crisis Providence had raised up some one to deliver it,—Maurice of Saxony, Queen Elizabeth, Gustavus Adolphus, and last of all William of Orange[2]. The fifth crisis, of which William was the hero, was "of the longest "continuance." It had begun in 1672, or at the latest in 1685, and it was not over yet. "We are yet in the "agitations of it," nor did it end till the accession of George I secured a Protestant line of kings for England. Burnet's *History of My Own Time* is an account of England during this fifth crisis, and this conception of the meaning of events and of their cause links his later book to his *History of the Reformation* and gives unity to his historical writings.

C. H. FIRTH.

[1] *Own Time*, I. 783, 789; II. 388, 512.

[2] For the five crises, which Burnet computes somewhat differently in the different recensions of his *History*, see *Supplement*, pp. 172–177, and *Own Time*, I. 310–321, 655.

PART I.

SCOTLAND.

1643—1674.

CHAPTER I.

FAMILY, HOME-LIFE AND TRAINING.

GILBERT BURNET belonged to an ancient and honourable Scottish family. It is probable that the Burnetts of Leys were of Anglo-Saxon origin, and that an ancestor of theirs coming from England in the train of David I settled in Roxburghshire. It is beyond question that Alexander Burnard aided King Robert the Bruce, and that the grateful king some six years after the battle of Bannockburn granted to "his beloved and trusty adherent" certain lands within the forest of Drum on the borders of Aberdeen and Kincardineshire. The house of Alexander Burnard was built on an island in the loch of Banchory, and his descendants remain in the parish of Banchory-Ternan to this day, the present Sir Thomas Burnett being the 24th laird and the 12th Baronet of Leys.

The Burnetts were not only able to keep what they had gained but to add to it, the family history for its first three centuries on Dee-side being a record of ever-increasing prosperity. In 1488 Alexander Burnet received a charter uniting all his lands into one free barony. But the most remarkable addition to the estates occurred in the lifetime of the ninth laird, also an Alexander, and is of great interest as shewing how the friends of the Roman Catholic Church as well as the reforming lords acquired Church lands. He married about 1540 Janet, the natural daughter of Prebendary Hamilton. The bride was well-dowered with the property of the Church, to which Cardinal Beaton, the abbot of Arbroath, greatly added "by granting under the seal of "the monastery to Alexander Burnet and his heirs-male a "charter of the various lands within the regality of Arbroath

"and barony of Banchory-Ternan[1] which he or the members 'of his family had held in lease." There is no doubt that this Alexander Burnet, who died in 1574, remained true to the Church which had been so generous to him. But it is certain that his grandson, also named Alexander, adopted the reformed faith. He had a large family and he fervently desired to give his sons a liberal education. Two of them became eminent physicians, a third was a minister of the Church of Scotland, a fourth—the most famous of all and to us the most interesting, because it was probably owing to his celebrity that the future Bishop received his name—was Gilbert, Professor of Philosophy at Basel and Montauban. He was held in such esteem that a national synod of the Protestants of France appointed his philosophical writings to be printed at the expense of the Church. But he died before his manuscripts were arranged, and only his book of ethics was printed. The eldest of the brothers, Alexander, succeeded to the estates in 1578. He was a man of singularly moderate views, but in his later days he evidently supported James VI in his Episcopal policy, for we find him appointed as one of the commissioners "to see that constant moderators "be received by the presbyteries." His second son Thomas succeeded him in 1619 and became the first baronet of the family in 1626. He was one of the leading covenanters of Aberdeenshire, but won the respect of both parties by his moderation. His third son James, the ancestor of the famous and eccentric Lord Monboddo, also took the side of the Covenant in the memorable struggle. The fourth (third surviving) son was Robert Burnet, the father of Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, of whom we must speak at greater length. He was born in 1592, a memorable year in the ecclesiastical annals of Scotland, for during its course the Act was passed which has been described as the Magna Charta of the Scottish Church. The Tulchan Episcopate was brought to an end and Presbyterianism established. Presbytery seemed triumphant all along the line. But the victory was not final. It ushered in that important

[1] It is curious that the two chief families in this Dee-side parish—the Burnetts of Leys and the Douglases of Tilwhilly—should each have given a prelate to the See of Salisbury. Bishop Douglas was also connected with Saltoun, his grandfather having been minister of the parish.

struggle which decided the form of the government of the Church of Scotland and has left such indelible marks on the national life, thought, and character. And much of the interest and the pathos in the lives of Robert Burnet and his more distinguished son lie in the fact that both these good and sincerely religious men were stout upholders of the cause that lost.

Of Robert Burnet's early career little is known. He adopted the legal profession, and we find him in France in 1611 prosecuting his studies but bitterly complaining about his father's parsimony.

"My father deals ouer hardlie w^t^ me," he writes, "and haid "rather I neglected my studies than that I cost some siller "til him in imploying my tyme weel. Gif he continue in that "resolution he will compel me to take ane resolution that "will not please him and bind myself for ever in France "qlk I haid done or now haid not my uncle impesched me."

The elder Burnet evidently wished his son to get a liberal education at the minimum of cost. The difficulty, however, was surmounted and the threat in the letter unfulfilled, for Robert Burnet returned to Scotland and was admitted to the Bar in 1617. Three years later he married Beatrix Maule, who died in 1622, leaving him a daughter, by name Bertha.

As a lawyer his acquirements were solid rather than brilliant. He was, his son informs us, "learned in his "profession, but did not rise up to the first form in practice. "His judgment was good, but he had not a lively imagination "nor a ready expression, and his abilities were depressed by "his excessive modesty....When he found a cause morally "unjust he would not plead in it, but pressed his client to "consider his conscience more than his interest, in which he "often succeeded, for he spoke with great authority on these "occasions....He was always ready to plead the causes of "the poor, and instead of taking fees from them he supplied "such as he saw were unjustly oppressed very liberally. "He never took any fee from a clergyman who sued for "the rights of his Church...and he told me the full half of "his practice went for charity or for friendship."

Such rules however do not seem to have kept him from being successful in his profession, for we find him as an

advocate of seventeen years' standing, the possessor of two landed estates, from one of which, Crimond, in Aberdeenshire, he afterwards took his territorial designation.

Of more interest to us than the success of the lawyer is the character of the man, which all the contemporary writers who mention him describe as of singular excellence. He seems to have been a quiet, peace-loving, God-fearing man, gentle, but by no means weak, for he had a large share of that "dourness" which has been reckoned a characteristic of his nation. His gentle nature shrank from all bitter disputes, but he shewed, as we shall see, that he could suffer for conscience' sake in circumstances where moral courage of a very high order was required.

In Church matters, which were the chief problem of the day, he was an Episcopalian of a very moderate kind. "He preferred Episcopacy (his son tells us) to all other "forms of government, and thought it was begun in the "apostles' time, yet he did not think it so necessary but that "he could live under another form, for indeed his principle "with relation to Church government was Erastian."

In fact, like his friends Sir Robert Moray and Bishop Leighton, he may be described as a fine type of those Erastian pietists of the seventeenth century who were more numerous and exercised a greater influence on the religious history of their country than has generally been supposed.

At this point it is necessary to explain the change that had taken place in the Scottish Church. We have seen that Presbyterianism had been established in 1592, the year of Robert Burnet's birth. But when James VI became king of England he resolutely set himself to assimilate the ecclesiastical governments of the two national Churches, and partly succeeded. The leading Presbyterian ministers who opposed the king's policy were banished, and bishops were introduced into the Scottish Church. It was probably the intention of the king to assimilate the ritual of the Churches also, but the temper in which the nation received the Five Articles of Perth convinced even James of the danger of proceeding further. The result was a curious compromise. The Church government now established might fairly be described as bishops superimposed on Presbytery. The bishops ordained the ministers, but only with the assistance

of ministers appointed to act with them. They presided over the Church Courts; but the four Presbyterian Courts, General Assembly, Synod, Presbytery, and Kirk-Session were still sanctioned by law. A strong party in the Church was in favour of bishops, but few regarded them as essential. In fact the doctrinal standard of the Church, the Scots Confession, declared "that apostolic succession through "bishops was not a mark of the Church." One point it is well to note. There was no schism. The Church of Scotland remained as it had been from the Reformation, one and undivided. "The Presbyterians," a Church historian says, "continued in the Church without making "secession or separation though they struggled against her "defections."

We have seen that Robert Burnet's sympathies were with Episcopacy. This is not surprising. His father had supported the policy of King James. He came from Aberdeenshire, the district in Scotland most favourable to Episcopacy. Two of his most intimate friends were Patrick Forbes the Bishop of Aberdeen, and William Forbes afterwards Bishop of Edinburgh. In politics too he was strongly attached to the king's party. That his friends did not belong to one party, however, is clearly shewn by the step he took seven years after his return from the Continent. The history of the family to which Rachel Johnston, his second wife, belonged, presents a strong contrast to the peace-loving, law-abiding Burnets. The Johnstons of Annandale were one of the most famous and lawless of the Border clans. In the wars against England they were always to be depended on, at other times they gave to their king such obedience as they saw fit. Even so late as 1593, the year after Robert Burnet was born, they defeated and slew the King's Warden in the battle of Dryfe Sands. If there is anything in heredity, a descendant of this race was not likely to favour the doctrine of the Divine right of kings. With this famous Border battle, however, Archibald Johnston, the grandfather of Rachel, had nothing to do. He had left Annandale many years before and had become a successful merchant in Edinburgh, where he married a wealthy heiress, Rachel Arnot. She was the daughter of Sir John Arnot, Lord Provost of

Edinburgh, and distinguished for her devotion to the Presbyterian cause. The eldest son of this marriage was James Johnston, who married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Thomas Craig, a famous Scotch lawyer and a most zealous Presbyterian. The third generation kept true to the family traditions. They united the strength of the Johnstons with the Presbyterian zeal of the Arnots and Craigs. There were no more sturdy champions of Presbyterianism or more consistent opponents of the absolutism of the king than Rachel Johnston and her younger brother Sir Archibald Johnston, Lord Warriston, the framer of the National League and Covenant.

Rachel Johnston is a most interesting type of a High Church Presbyterian lady of the 17th century. She was fearless even to rashness in defence of the cause she loved, sincerely religious, but intolerant and narrow, a fanatical believer in the Divine right of Presbytery. But withal she was a true woman, who proved herself an affectionate wife and devoted mother.

Twenty-seven years afterwards when Robert Burnet made his will he speaks of her thus:

"Item, I leave my well-beloved spouse (of whose "carriage I have had so long proof and experience and "of whom I have had so great comfort blessed be God for "it) my only Executrix. Item, having had the experience of "the extraordinary motherly care and affection that my said "spouse carries to her children I leave her tutrix Testamen-"trix to my said sons, and straitly charge and command my "said sons to give full and absolute obedience to their said "mother in all their worldly affairs, as to myself if I were in "life, if they would wish the blessing of God to be upon them, "and ordain them to remain still with their said mother as "long as they remain at school."

These words, written in 1651 after the troublous period of the Covenants, are strong testimony of an enduring affection between husband and wife which many trials and much difference of opinion had failed to overthrow.

At the time of the marriage, however, the feeling between the ecclesiastical parties was not so bitter as it afterwards became. Episcopacy and Presbytery were considered by many to be compatible. Presbyterians and

Episcopalians worshipped in the same church side by side. But neither party was satisfied and ill-feeling was steadily growing. During the next thirteen years eight children were born to Robert Burnet, and the witnesses of their baptisms shew clearly how he fraternised with both parties. Among the names we find John Earl of Lauderdale, Sir James Skene of Curriehill, and, strangest of all, in 1636 the names of Thomas Sydserf, Bishop of Galloway, and Archibald Johnston stand side by side. It was perhaps the last time these two men met in friendship, for on July 23rd, 1637, occurred the historic riot in St Giles's Cathedral occasioned by King Charles I attempting to force Laud's Liturgy on the unwilling Scottish Church. The long-simmering discontent with the policy of the king and the people's hatred of the bishops broke into open revolt. The struggle between Episcopacy and Presbytery entered on a new phase. The day of compromise was over, the war of extermination had begun. It was a national rising. All classes took part in it: never had Scotland been so unanimous. It is true that the nobles and gentry had been deeply offended by the Act of Revocation with regard to the Church lands which the king had forced on Parliament, but it is absurd to suggest that the people would have stirred for such a cause. The driving force of the revolution was a religious one. The people were stubbornly opposed to the king's Church policy and were determined to submit no longer to his despotic dictation. The nation was united in opposing absolutism in Church and State. In this crisis Archibald Johnston, the brother-in-law of Burnet, leaped into prominence. The leaders of the movement realising the danger of their action sought to bind the nation together in the National League and Covenant, in the drawing up of which Johnston took a great part. The great majority of the people eagerly signed the Covenant, and pressure was brought to bear upon those who were unwilling. Robert Burnet was one of the minority. His position was a trying one. His two brothers, his wife and her relatives were all strong supporters of the Covenant. He himself had been so outspoken in his criticism of the conduct of some of the bishops that he had been regarded as a Puritan. But he was firmly opposed

to the abolition of Episcopacy and strongly disapproved of the armed resistance of the nation.

"Not that he thought that it was not lawful to rise in "arms when the king broke the laws, for he always espoused "Barclay and Grotius' notions in that matter, but he "thought that was not the case, but that the king's authority "was invaded against law."

The great strength of the man revealed itself. He firmly refused to sign the Covenant, the only man of note in Edinburgh who dared to do so. The consequence was that he was forced to give up his legal practice, and twice between the years 1637–43 he had to take refuge on the Continent. Probably he returned in 1641 at the time of the king's visit. The bishops had been deposed, Presbyterianism had been reestablished, and honours were being showered upon the leaders of the Covenant. Among these was Burnet's brother-in-law, who was knighted and promoted to the judicial Bench with the title of Lord Warriston.

The rise of this able lawyer had indeed been remarkable. Though only thirty years of age Archibald Johnston was one of the best known men in Scotland. His legal knowledge and skill had been invaluable to the Covenanting party. No one had been more zealous for the cause. A very religious man, he is a striking example of the extreme High Church Presbyterians of his day with all their strength and weakness. Strong, but very narrow, pure in life, sincere and devout, praying five or six hours each day, he was also intolerant and ready to unchurch and excommunicate all who differed from him even in the external forms of religion.

"He had," as his nephew tells us, "the temper of an "inquisitor in him. He did overdrive all their counsels and "was the chief instrument of the ruin of his party by the "fury and cruelty of the proceedings in which he was always "the principal leader. But after all that appeared in his "public actions he was a sincere and self-denying enthusiast, "and though he had twelve children he never considered his "family but was generous and charitable."

No man was more opposed to Warriston's political opinions than Robert Burnet, yet each respected the other. Events were now about to take place which strained but

did not break their friendship. In 1642 the Civil War in England began. The Scotch would gladly have remained neutral. But unfortunately for the cause of Charles the great majority of the Scottish people did not trust him, and feared that if he were victorious he would immediately revoke the concessions which had been wrung from him by force. Alarmed therefore at the course of the war, for the arms of Charles were everywhere victorious, the Church party listened with favour to the earnest appeal of the English Parliament. The result was the Solemn League and Covenant.

It was at this troubled period in Scottish history that the eleventh and youngest child of Robert Burnet was born, Sept. 18th, 1643, and was baptized three days later by the name of Gilbert. His uncle Sir Archibald Johnston was one of the witnesses. It could not have been an occasion of unmixed joy, for everyone present must have known that there was every likelihood of Robert Burnet being again driven into exile. On the 25th of Sept. 1643, exactly one week after the birth of Gilbert, the English Parliament accepted the Solemn League and Covenant, which assured them of the assistance of a Scotch army but bound them "to seek the preservation of the Reformed Religion in "Scotland and the Reformation of Religion in England and "Ireland in doctrine, worship and government according to "the Word of God and the example of the best Reformed "Churches."

This was followed in Scotland on Oct. 22nd by an ordinance of the Committee of Estates enforcing (on pain of excommunication and forfeiture of goods) the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant.

Robert Burnet firmly declined to sign it. He maintained that there was no justification for the Covenanters taking up arms against their lawful king in a quarrel concerning the liberties and privileges of the English Parliament, of the nature of which most Scotsmen were ignorant. He refused to sign a Covenant which had not the consent of "the lawful Supreme Magistrate," which forced the conscience of some "not in the substance of religion, "but in circumstantial points of Church government." "To impose on men's consciences," he says, "covenants

"containing duties not only not expressly commanded in the "Word of God but...outside if not contrary thereto and that "under pain of excommunication seems hard to weak and "tender consciences and smells not a little of the anti-"christian tyranny of Rome." Such conscientious objections received but scant consideration from the prevailing party, and the stern but upright Warriston "thought it a crime to "shew his brother-in-law any other favour but to suffer him "to go and live beyond the sea."

Robert Burnet retired to Paris, where he met among others Grotius, whose views on theology and law he largely adopted. There also he met his old friend Sydserf, the deposed Bishop of Galloway. Warriston having heard of this renewed intimacy wrote warning his brother-in-law against having any dealings with an excommunicated person. Burnet replied in a most spirited manner, firmly refusing to break off a friendship of 27 years, declaring that he had never heard of a greater injustice than the excommunication of his friend.

"Alas, brother! what would you be at, now when you "have beggared him and chased him by club law out of the "country? Would you have him reduced to despair, and will "you exact that every man, yea against his conscience, shall "approve your deeds how unjust soever, yea out of the "country?...Be not too violent then," he adds, "and do as you "would be done to, for you know not how the world will turn "yet," a warning to which the subsequent fate of Warriston was to lend a grim significance.

Meanwhile the first five years of Gilbert Burnet's life were passing in a troubled and rapidly changing scene. The Solemn League and Covenant did much for the liberties of Great Britain, but its first triumph was not in the land of its birth. The army sent to England turned the fortunes of the Civil War at Long Marston Moor. But in Scotland there was not that unanimity which marked the National League and Covenant of 1638.

In 1644–5 Montrose, an old Covenanter now on the other side, conducted his brilliant campaigns, so useless to his king, so terrible for his country, till his victorious career was stopped and the excesses of his army terribly revenged at Philiphaugh. But when the Civil War ended in

England the worst troubles of Scotland began. The loyalty of Scotland had hitherto not been conspicuous, but in his darkest days the unfortunate Charles I was to find there his warmest friends. In both Covenants a willingness to support the king in his lawful rights had been plainly expressed, though the duty to religion had been placed highest. Now, when there was no danger to the latter principle, the Scots were to shew that their professions of attachment to the king's person were no mere words. The king was in captivity, and the danger of a darker fate had begun to alarm the nation. A united and enthusiastic Scotch army would have marched to his rescue had Charles agreed to accept the Solemn League and Covenant. But this he refused to do; worse still, he sought by a compromise to divide his sympathisers, in which he succeeded only too well. He made a secret treaty, known as the Engagement, with some Scotch nobles, agreeing to give Presbyterianism a trial for three years. This satisfied the Scotch nobility and gentry who controlled Parliament, but not the Church or the majority of the people. After an earnest but vain endeavour to persuade the Church, Parliament in spite of the protests of the General Assembly took its own course, and an army composed of impressed soldiers who abhorred the service, and under the incapable leadership of Hamilton, marched over the border to certain defeat at Preston (Aug. 19th, 1648). This defeat, regarded by most Scotsmen as a Divine judgment, placed the power in the hands of the extreme fanatical party led by Argyle and Warriston. To them was due the passing of the notorious and mischievous Act of Classes, which disqualified all "malignants" (*i.e.* those who had taken any part in the Engagement) from holding office in the State or in the army.

But the ascendency of the extreme Church party did not mean the end of the Royalist reaction, for when Charles I was executed Jan. 30th, 1649, the indignant Scotch nation at once proclaimed his son king. Assurance was sent to the prince in Holland that Scotland would unanimously support him against all foes if he would sign the Covenant. After some hesitation he accepted the terms. There is nothing stranger in history than this

unnatural alliance. A prince who had little respect for religion and none whatever for morality found in the day of adversity his only supporters in those religious enthusiasts, the sternly moral Covenanters. He was unutterably wearied by their long religious services, and never forgave them for presuming to reprove the faults of his character. They never quite trusted him, yet with a pathetic loyalty they fought for the man who was to be the deadliest foe of the cause they loved so well.

Charles landed in June, 1650, and Cromwell moved at once against Scotland. A Covenanting army, purged of all "malignants" (in accordance with the Act of Classes), met him at Dunbar and was completely defeated. Even this severe blow did not crush the national spirit, but it deprived the extreme fanatical party led by Warriston of its influence. The moderate Presbyterians led by the able minister Robert Douglas now asserted themselves. They proceeded to crown Charles at Scone on Jan. 1st, 1651. They resolved to repeal the disgraceful Act of Classes, which had deprived the army of its best officers at Dunbar. By this they earned for their party the name of Resolutioners; the members of Warriston's fanatical party being henceforth known as Remonstrants or Protesters, from their vigorous opposition to the repeal of the Act. Finally an army made up of both Covenanters and Engagers, and under the command of David Leslie, marched into England and was defeated at Worcester Sept. 3rd, 1651. This was the close of the war. Charles was again driven into exile and the Scotch nation sullenly submitted to the firm rule of Oliver Cromwell.

The events of this exciting period made an indelible impression on the young mind of Gilbert Burnet and exercised no little influence on his education and future career. His father had probably returned from exile about the time of the Engagement, for we find him in trouble with the Edinburgh Presbytery during the following year. For this court he drew up reasons "why he could not with "a safe conscience sign the League and Covenant." His friend Robert Douglas saved him from the consequences of this act by suppressing the paper, but Burnet found it advisable to retire for a while to Dalkeith. There he made

the friendship of Robert Leighton, minister of Newbattle, afterwards the well-known Archbishop of Glasgow. Naturally a consistent Royalist like Robert Burnet rejoiced in the coming of Charles II, and we find that he was present with his young son at some of those long religious services by which the ministers sought to impress upon the prince those principles his character so sadly lacked. "I remember," writes the future bishop, "on one fast day there were six "sermons preached without intermission. I was there "myself and not a little weary of so tedious a service."

Memories of the hopes and fears, the grief and dismay of this trying and changeful period clung to the lad. He tells a story, that somewhat soothed the national vanity—how when victory was certain the Committee of Estates (his uncle Warriston being a member) forced the able Covenanting general Leslie against his better judgment to leave his secure position on Doon Hill, and so lose the disastrous battle of Dunbar. He witnessed the dismay of his countrymen after the battle of Worcester, when they felt that all resistance was at an end and that they were conquered by the English sectaries. He heard the violent recriminations of the Resolutioners and Protesters, in which each party blamed the other for the national humiliation. He describes what he himself, a boy of eight years old, saw when Cromwell's troops entered Aberdeen under General Overton.

"I remember well," he writes, "of the coming of three "regiments to Aberdeen. There was an order and discipline "and a face of gravity among them that amazed all people. "Most of them were Independents and Anabaptists: they "were all gifted men and preached as they were moved, but "they never disturbed the public assemblies in the churches "but once. They came and reproached the preacher for "laying to their charge things that were false, I was then "present. The debate grew very fierce: at last they drew "their swords but there was no hurt done. Yet Cromwell "displaced the general for not punishing this."

The following estimate by Gilbert Burnet, a consistent Royalist, is at once proof of his impartiality and a singular tribute to the excellence of Cromwell's government.

"There was good justice done and vice was suppressed

"and punished so that we always reckon these years of "usurpation a time of great peace and prosperity."

This description is perfectly true of the commerce and industry of the nation. The nobility however did not fare so well, but were in a state of bankruptcy, while in the Church anarchy prevailed. It was incomparably the worst period in the history of Scottish Presbyterianism. The Church was rent in twain by the fierce quarrels of the Resolutioners and Protesters. The General Assembly, the only Church Court which had sufficient power to cope with the evil, had been forbidden by Cromwell to meet. Synod and Presbytery meetings were scenes of disgraceful wrangling. Numberless pamphlets sown broadcast throughout the land embittered the disputes. Meanwhile Gilbert Burnet—a precocious boy—was growing up and watching ecclesiastical affairs. Little wonder if he formed the opinion from what he saw that the Presbyterian system and good order and discipline in the Church were incompatible.

The years of the Commonwealth were among the happiest in the long life of Robert Burnet. He took no part in public affairs, though Cromwell, acting probably on the advice of the English governor of Aberdeen, tried to induce him to accept office as a Judge of the Supreme Court. Knowing him to be a Royalist the Protector only made one stipulation "that Burnet would not act against "the Government." This generous offer was wisely declined, Burnet "asking for nothing but leave to live in peace and "quietness without the imposition of oaths and subscriptions." He was sixty years old in 1652 and his declining years were to be spent in the peace for which he had longed. It was little sacrifice that he had to give up the legal profession, for he did not like it; and he could now enjoy the quiet life of a country gentleman on his estate at Crimond, devoting himself to the interests of his children and to those religious studies he so dearly loved.

Of his mother Gilbert Burnet writes, "She was a "good, religious woman, but most violently engaged in the "Presbyterian way."

His father, to whom he was strongly attached, he describes at greater length: "He was a preacher of "righteousness, for he catechised not only his servants but his

"tenants frequently at every Lord's Day, of which he was a "very strict observer: and indeed to all that came to him he "commended the practice of religion and virtue with great "earnestness and often with many tears. He treated those "who differed from him in opinion with great gentleness." To the high character of Robert Burnet others bear ample testimony, and we may especially quote Dr Cockburn (no friend of the son), who considers it was Gilbert's misfortune to lose his father so early, "for the father would "have been a curb to his youthful levities and extravagancies, "but that restraint being taken off Gilbert gave all liberty to "his curious, heedless and precipitant genius."

Most of the eleven children of Robert Burnet had died young. Only four of them can be traced after his return from exile,—Rachel, who was married to Sir Thomas Nicolson, the King's Advocate; Thomas, born in 1636, who afterwards became a well-known physician; Robert, who was studying for the legal profession; and Gilbert, who was probably the only one of the children much at home during the Crimond period.

The chief care of Robert Burnet's retirement was the education of his youngest son. According to Gilbert the discipline was of a Spartan character.

"My father," he says, "humbled me with much severe "correction, in which, how much soever I might deserve it "by many wild frolics, yet I think he carried that too far, for "the fear of that brought me under too great an uneasiness "and sometimes even to a hatred of my father."

The education however was very successful in its results. "I was sent to no school," he writes, "but was taught Latin "by my father with so much success that before I was ten years "old I was master of that tongue and of the classic authors."

In October, 1652, he entered the Marischall College of Aberdeen University, where he remained for five years "and "went through the common methods of the Aristotelian "philosophy with no small applause," becoming Master of Arts in June, 1657, before he was fourteen years of age. "All that while," he tells us, "my father superintended my "studies, making me rise at four o'clock in the morning." "But," he adds with much *naïveté*, "he perhaps loaded me "with too much learning for I was excessively vain of it."

Such a system of education applied to one less robust in body and mind might well have produced a mere pedant. But there was in Gilbert Burnet an intense vitality, intellectual and physical, which no discipline could subdue. To the last he retained with a youthful exuberance of energy an almost childlike simplicity of mind. Talkative, conceited and self-confident he certainly was, but his egotism was largely redeemed by the amusing candour with which he confesses his faults, by his imperturbable good-nature and his great kindliness of heart. He had the singular ability, the restless energy and activity of the Johnstons, their impulsiveness and their indiscretion in speech. But, like his father, he had not in him the slightest trace of the fanatic or the Pharisee and he was plentifully endowed with a fund of shrewd common-sense. Like both father and mother he was honest in conviction, faithful and courageous in duty, sincere in religion. In fact much that makes the character of Gilbert Burnet so interesting may be traced to the union of and training given by Robert Burnet and Rachel Johnston, the latter "a Puritan with "the chill on," the former "a Puritan with the chill off."

But it was not only in his regular studies that his father's influence was felt. From him Gilbert inherited his passion for political anecdote. "I had," he says, "while very "young a greater knowledge of affairs than is usual at that "age, for my father, who had been engaged in great friend-"ships with men of both sides, as he took my education "wholly into his own hands so he took a sort of pleasure to "relate to me the series of public affairs." It appears, in fact, that the elder Burnet was on the point of anticipating his more famous son as the historian of his own times, for "he "was importuned by men of all sides to write the history of "these distempered times, being esteemed a person of great "moderation and candour....Warriston, in whose hands were "all the original papers of the Covenanters' side, offered "them to him for his assistance if he would undertake it: "but he was overgrown with age and infirmities and so "could not undertake so difficult a work."

The future profession of Gilbert became now a matter for serious consideration and the decision being left to himself he chose the profession of law. This was a great

disappointment to his father, whose hope was that his youngest son should enter the ministry. But after a year of legal study Gilbert told his father that he had changed his mind and now wished to be a minister. "My father," he writes, "was overjoyed at this and ran out with many "tears into a heavenly discourse of the nobleness of a "function that was dedicated to God and to the saving of "souls, and charged me to study not out of vanity nor "ambition but to understand the Scriptures well and to have "a true sense of Divine matters in my own mind. He "continued to the end of his days repeating many good "instructions to me. He told me that he had seen much "ambition, great covetousness, and violent animosities among "our Bishops which had ruined the Church. He charged "me to treat all who differed from me with gentleness and "moderation and to apply myself chiefly to prayer, the "reading the Scriptures and the practical part."

It seems strange that the elder Burnet should rejoice so greatly at his son's decision to enter the Church when we remember that this involved the acceptance of Presbyterian government, the signing of the Westminster Confession and of the Covenant. The first obstacle was a slight one, for being an avowed Erastian he laid little stress on outward forms though he was deeply concerned with the essentials of religion. His attitude towards the Confession is not clear, though he seems to have been an Arminian rather than a Calvinist. His chief objection to the Covenant may have been removed by the signature of the "Supreme "Magistrate" Charles II. The most probable explanation however is that given (by the author of Part II of this work) that "it was an example of the extravagant sacrifices "that the 17th century Erastians were prepared to make "for peace."

Gilbert Burnet threw himself into the studies of his three years' Divinity Course with characteristic ardour. He read over twenty volumes in folio of school divinity, though one result of this, he tells us with his usual frankness, "was to heighten my vanity and make me despise and "triumph over all who had not suffered themselves to be "entangled with that cobweb stuff. I read also," he continues, "many volumes of history of all sorts, so that I

"furnished myself with much matter which I laid out on all "occasions."

Shortly after the close of his last session at the University of Aberdeen Charles II returned to the throne of his ancestors, an event that was hailed with delirious joy by the people of Scotland. Nothing shows more clearly how little men anticipated the great change the Restoration was to make in the Scottish Church than the fact that it did not interrupt Gilbert Burnet's progress towards the ministry. Nor need this be wondered at. Had not the king two months after his return written to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, "We do resolve to protect and preserve the "government of the Church of Scotland as it is settled by "law"? Scotland had yet to learn what the king's word was worth and to pay dearly for the knowledge. So Burnet went forward to his examination before the Presbytery and passed his trials at the close of the year 1660, becoming a probationer of the Church when he was little more than seventeen years of age.

The faithful loyalty of Burnet's father was at last rewarded. He was made a Judge in January, 1661, and shortly afterwards a Baron of the Exchequer. He was also offered a knighthood, which he declined. He took his seat on the bench with the title of Lord Crimond on 1st June, 1661. It is probable that his family accompanied him to Edinburgh, for Gilbert tells that he witnessed the execution of James Guthrie, a leader of the Remonstrants or extreme Covenanting party. The unjust sentence on this minister, who though extreme in his religious views had done nothing worthy of death, was commonly ascribed to personal resentment in high quarters. Warriston, Gilbert's uncle, would have shared the same fate but escaped by flight for a time.

Such things weighed heavy on the spirit of the gentle Lord Crimond. "He was distressed that men's resentments "were so high for what was past." He was greatly alarmed at the outburst of vice that had taken place immediately after the Restoration and especially at the proceedings of Middleton's "Drunken Parliament." He saw from the passing of the Rescissory Act, which swept away twenty-three years' legislation, that it was the intention to establish

Episcopacy, and Episcopal though he was in his sympathies, he disapproved of the method used for its restoration, and "did very much apprehend that great disorders would "follow."

He was now burdened with years and his great desire was to see his youngest son settled as a parish minister. The opportunity came, for, writes Gilbert, "I was pre-"sented by Sir Alex. Burnet with a benefice where his "family resided and in the centre of our kindred. My father "left it to me to consider whether I would accept it or not "but plainly intimated his wishes that I would. There is no "law in Scotland that limits the age of a clergyman but by "the happy Providence of God I refused it. I thought that "one that was not yet eighteen ought not to undertake a "cure of souls. Persons of that age are so apt to have a "good opinion of themselves and to desire a settlement that "especially considering my father's infirmities and the value "of the benefice; I wonder how I came to be so wise and "good as to refuse it. But I have often blessed God for it "since and have observed what a happiness it was not to be "engaged in such a station before I was better prepared "for it."

In the same year Gilbert had to mourn the loss of his father, who died 24th Aug., 1661, after a short illness. The loss to him was very great. Many years after he writes, "I "am sensible that it may be thought I have said too much "of him, but I hope the reader will allow this return of "piety to one of the best fathers that ever man was blessed "with."

CHAPTER II.

YOUTH, FRIENDS AND EARLY TRAVELS.

It is somewhat difficult to explain the Restoration Government's policy towards the Scottish Church. When Charles I interfered with the Church he believed he was acting from religious principle, but it would be absurd to ascribe any such motive to his son. Charles II had no gratitude for the devotion which had stirred thousands of Covenanters to fight and die in the attempt to put him on the throne. But the affronts that he had suffered from some of them during his visit to Scotland he neither forgot nor forgave. The experience made him hate Presbyterianism as cordially as his father and grandfather had done. Still, self-interest was always a stronger motive with Charles than hatred and it did seem a perilous thing to raise trouble in any part of his dominions so soon after the Restoration. Lauderdale, the ablest, the most far-seeing and the most unscrupulous of his advisers, earnestly dissuaded him from attempting to establish Episcopacy. He reminded the king that the troubles of the last two reigns began with the same policy; he urged that in the event of a crisis arising in England Scotland would be devoted to the king's service if the Church were left alone. A clever man like Charles must have felt the force of such arguments which his own experience confirmed. He listened however too readily to the assurance of the Earl of Middleton that a reaction had taken place and that the nation would now welcome Episcopacy. No doubt there was some truth in the statement. The sordid and interminable quarrels of the Resolutioners and Protesters had offended the lovers of peace and order. The nobles and the majority of the landed gentry, in whose hands the power of Parliament lay,

were tired of the Covenants and were ready not only to accede to but to anticipate the king's wishes. But there is little evidence that the change of feeling had affected the other classes of the people. The Rescissory Act, sweeping away the legislation of twenty-three years and making the Church of Scotland again Episcopal, alarmed and united the Presbyterians. The words of the king's letter to which they had blindly trusted, "We do resolve to protect and "preserve the government of the Church of Scotland as "established by law," had now a very different meaning. From the Presbyteries and Synods which met in April and May protests came, denouncing "the scandal" that ministers wished Episcopacy, till Middleton, disturbed by the strength of the feeling, suppressed the meetings with the strong hand. There was one significant exception. The Synod of Aberdeen, where the Episcopal party had always been strongest, sent a petition concluding with the prayer, "That "since the legal authority upon which their courts proceeded "was now annulled that therefore the king and Parliament "would settle their government conform to the Scriptures "and the rules of the primitive Church."

There was however no popular rising as in 1637. The people preserved an ominous silence. Perhaps neither Charles nor his ministers suspected that the Scotch democracy was the power with which they had to reckon.

Gilbert Burnet was only eighteen years old when his father died. It is not probable that at that age he had formed his own opinions on questions of Church and State. Most likely he adopted the views of his father whom he so greatly revered. Robert Burnet, as we have seen, was an Erastian who, preferred Episcopacy. He was also a fervent loyalist who though not believing in the Divine Right of Kings yet was willing to invest the Royal prerogative with an authority in Church and State which most of his countrymen were disposed to question. His training probably gave the first impulse and guidance to his son's career. It is clear that when the crisis arose Gilbert, though a licentiate of the Presbyterian Church, had a decided inclination to Episcopacy. He had lived in a district favourable to that cause. He had been present at the meeting of the Aberdeen Synods, had heard its somewhat cautiously worded

petition and agreed with its purpose. He had only seen Presbyterianism in its worst period and had no confidence in its power to restore order in the Church.

Nor was he favourably impressed with the Presbyterian ministers whom he met.

"I could never esteem them much," he says; "I saw little "of the sublime, either of piety, virtue or learning among "them. Yet I must say on the other hand I saw so much "sincere zeal, such a sobriety, and purity of deportment, such "an application to prayer, to reading the Scriptures, and a "true though over-scrupulous observance of the Lord's Day, "that has for ever secured me from uncharitable thoughts of "them or severe proceedings against them."

At his mother's house in Edinburgh he often met the famous Presbyterian minister Robert Douglas. This remarkable man, the leader of the moderate Presbyterians, had been an intimate friend of Robert Burnet. He was held in extraordinary respect by all parties and is indeed one of the most interesting personalities of that time. He had done a great deal to bring about the restoration of Charles II, an event that ruined his ministerial career. Of unbending integrity he resolutely refused every inducement —even the highest office in the Church—to desert Presbytery for Episcopacy. It is perhaps natural that there should have been no great affection between the inflexible Presbyterian and the young licentiate who was intending to conform. Burnet however draws the portrait of Douglas very well, though with a somewhat grudging pen. "He had "something," he says, "very great in his countenance. His "looks showed both much wisdom and great thoughtfulness "but withal a vast pride. He was generally very silent. I "confess I never admired anything he said....He was a man "of great personal courage, which he showed often in Germany "more signally than became his profession; yet he was a "very mild, good-natured man (though that did not much "appear in his countenance) and he was of a most unblame-"able conversation as to all private matters."

Of Douglas' preaching Burnet gives the following account: "This was his great faculty in preaching that he "laid all the Scriptures relating to any point together but it "was a skeleton of bones, for he neither connected them

"well nor made he lively reflections on them. His chief "excellence in preaching was that he would have made his "matter look towards the present times with such dexterity "that though it was visible what he meant he could not be "questioned upon it."

Another able and learned minister also a frequent visitor at the house of Burnet's mother was George Hutcheson. Nor was Gilbert drawn more to him.

"He affected great mirth," he says, "and was much "given to raillery, but it was neither grave nor witty "and he seemed to be a proud man. He married my "cousin-germane so that I was well acquainted with him."

Burnet, while readily acknowledging that others whose judgment he valued had a very different opinion, thus criticises Hutcheson's preaching; "He had a great subtlety "in preaching and drew out one thing very ingeniously "from another which I thought was like wire-drawing and "ever despised it."

Such being his opinion of the most eminent of the Presbyterian ministers it was very evident that he was not to be one of their followers. His mother, brothers and sisters, who were strongly opposed to Episcopacy, became alarmed.

"Soon after my father's death," he writes, "my brother "Robert died. He was rising up to be very eminent in the "law....My mother's kindred pressed me very much to "return to the study of the law but I told them I had put "my hand to the plough and could not look back."

The indignation of all the members of the household at Gilbert's intention to become an Episcopal minister was very strong. In all likelihood the ministers were asked to use their influence, and possibly Burnet refers to the interference of Douglas in this matter when he says, "I "wondered to see him express such mean compliances "with silly women of their party as I have seen him do to "my own mother and sister."

The relations of the other members of the household with the youngest son seem to have been sufficiently strained if they did not come to open rupture.

He thus speaks of the value of the friendships he made with Nairn and Charteris at this time. "That I fell into

"such hands after I had so long cast off all restraint and "was now beginning to take my ply, was so great a blessing "to me and had such effects on me that to this day I count "myself bound in my daily thanksgiving to thank God for "the happy providence of falling into their acquaintance "and friendship."

It was one of the charms of Burnet's character that he had a genius for friendship. He made many excellent friends in his youth whom he cherished all his life. The two ministers to whom he refers were men who chose to live a quiet life, firmly refusing preferment which was offered and deserved. Their names and characters would alike have been forgotten had they not been preserved by the affection of Burnet. He remembered them to the last with undying gratitude and veneration.

The first was James Nairn, the minister of the Abbey Church in Edinburgh.

"He was," says Burnet, "the politest man I ever knew "bred in Scotland and the most eloquent of all our preachers. "He considered the pastoral function as a dedication of the "whole man to God and His service. He read the moral "philosophers much...and turned it all into melting devotion. "He had a true notion of superstition as a narrowness of "soul and a meanness of thought in religion. He studied to "raise all who conversed with him to great notions of God "and an universal charity. This made him pity the "Presbyterians as men of low notions and ill tempers....In "a word he was the brightest man I ever knew among "the Scottish divines."

Burnet greatly admired this minister's preaching and took it as his pattern. Nairn helped his young friend in his studies, turning his attention especially to the Platonic philosophy. He also exercised a great influence in instructing and confirming him in the doctrine of passive obedience, of which he was a stout upholder.

The second of Burnet's lifelong friends made at this time was Laurence Charteris, minister of Yester in Haddingtonshire. "I saw in him," says Burnet, "a grave "and solemn simplicity joined with great prudence. He "seemed dead to the world and had no mixture of vanity or "self-conceit. He hated controversies and disputes as dry

"and lifeless things. He loved the mystical divines and "thought he found in them a better savour of Divine "matters than in most other writers. There was no affect- "ation in him. His sermons were plain and easy, little "different from common discourse, insisting chiefly on our "being resigned in all things to the will of God and our "loving and obeying Him, and our living in the daily "expectation of death and judgment....He was a very "perfect friend and a sublime Christian."

Both Nairn and Charteris were Erastians and conformed to Episcopacy. In disposition they were strangely unlike Burnet, but his reverence for them was great and they exercised no little influence on his future life.

The winter months of 1661-62 were passed in hard and varied study. Among the books he looked into were the sermons of the Episcopal divines, his opinion of them not being very high. "I could never read them," he confesses, "even those of the then admired Bishop Andrews." But he found great delight in the study of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, "which did so fix me," he says, "that "I never departed from the principles laid down by him, nor "was I a little delighted with the modesty and charity that "I observed in him, which edified me as much as his book "instructed me."

Meanwhile public events of great importance were taking place. In April the four Scottish bishops who had been consecrated at Westminster travelled northward. One of them, Leighton, already displeased with his colleagues and disliking all parade, left them at Morpeth and travelled alone. The other three made a triumphal entry into Edinburgh escorted by the Lord Chancellor, the nobility, and the city magistrates. Burnet was a spectator and remarks, "There was something in the pomp of that "entry that did not look like the humility of their "function."

He hastened to hear Leighton preach, and was fascinated from the first. "He had such a way of "preaching," he says, "that I never knew any come near it. "His thoughts were the most ravishing, his style the most "beautiful (if not too fine), but his way of uttering them so "grave and so tender that I never heard him preach without

"trembling for one great part of the sermon and weeping for "another, and I confess that his way of preaching was so "much above all others that I had ever heard or anything "that I could ever hope to attain that for some time after "every sermon of his I both preached myself and heard all "others with indignation. And yet he really seemed so to "undervalue himself that he always chose to preach to mean "auditories."

This remarkable man, whose preaching so enchanted Burnet, was the son of a Scotsman, Dr Leighton, who became a fanatical Presbyterian minister in England and was most inhumanly punished by Archbishop Laud. Robert Leighton was sent to Edinburgh University, where he developed a character of singular excellence. He was a deeply religious man, in whom neither fanaticism nor sectarian bitterness found any place, in whom even the sufferings of his father stirred no vengeful feeling. His gentle nature dwelt apart from the stirring controversies of the day: the bitter feelings they excited were beyond his understanding. While the contest was raging around him, dragging into its vortex even the most peaceable of mortals, he was never heard to utter an angry word. He moved through the troubled scenes like a being from another sphere, earnestly but vainly endeavouring to persuade men to peace and charity, at once the embarrassment and the admiration of partizans. But with all this he was not a strong man. He lacked the foresight, the decision and the strength of purpose that make a leader of men. He had a saintly purity but a saint's ignorance of the world, and this ignorance often placed him in positions where he should not have been. He belonged in turn to every party of the period. He was an upholder of both Covenants. He approved of the Engagement but not openly. He accepted from Cromwell the office of Principal of the Edinburgh University. And now at the Restoration he was persuaded to accept a Bishopric, though he did not believe in the virtue of Episcopal ordination. No doubt he accepted the office in the hope that it would bring the miserable ecclesiastical dissensions to an end. From what he had already seen of his colleagues, however, he feared that he had made a mistake, and he began his work in

Scotland full of sad forebodings that after-events were to justify only too well.

Soon after he had heard Leighton preach Burnet made his acquaintance, and the friendship thus begun continued without the least break till Leighton's death. It may have been their very unlikeness that drew these two men so closely together. Each admired in the other qualities that his own character lacked. Leighton's want of decision and his ignorance of the world made him lean on his impulsive, energetic young friend; while Burnet could not express too strongly his admiration of the bishop and his gratitude for the friendship which he warmly declares to have been the greatest blessing of his life.

"I can truly say," he writes, "I never was with him but "I felt within me a commentary on these words, 'Did not "'our hearts burn within us while He talked with us?' He "led me into higher thoughts than I had formerly known, "both of a more total deadness to the world, and of a more "entire dedication of my whole life to the service of God, "and to the good of souls. He quite emancipated me from "the servility I was yet in to systems and received opinions, "and spoke always of religion as a thing above opinions and "parties, and that these things were of no consequence. He "also spake much to me of humility and abasement, of being "nothing in one's eyes, and of being willing to be nothing in "the eyes of the world."

"Total deadness to the world" was in truth never a feature of Burnet's character, though it was an ideal that hovered before him all his life. He honestly strove to imitate the restful aloofness of the pietists, but in vain. His qualities were to be shown in a very different way. At the same time the influence of the older man helped Burnet to be a faithful minister, and he was soon to take part in work where the friendship of Leighton was to prove invaluable.

Meanwhile Episcopacy was running its troubled course in Scotland. That the people ever longed for it is a purely fanciful statement. Had prudent and moderate counsels prevailed it is possible that its cause might have been successful. But it must be confessed that the Episcopal Church was most unfortunate in its leaders. Sharp,

Archbishop of St Andrews, was the worst hated man in Scotland. He had been sent to London to promote the Presbyterian cause and had returned Archbishop. Fairfoul, the Archbishop of Glasgow, also an old Covenanter, was a man of little worth and in his brief term of office did more injury to the Episcopal cause than any other man. The Earl of Middleton, who was at the head of the Government, was a drunken profligate. No wonder that the attempt to set up Episcopacy with the aid of such men seemed to the saintly Leighton "like a fighting against God." Positive madness seemed to possess the administration. Lay patronage, which had been abolished in 1649, was restored in 1662. The ministers who had been appointed in the intervening years were to be allowed to retain their livings if they took presentation from the patrons and accepted institution from the bishops before Michaelmas. As this meant acknowledgment of Episcopacy most of the ministers declined to do so. The Archbishop of Glasgow accordingly obtained an Act of Council declaring those parishes vacant whose ministers had not accepted the conditions of the Patronage Act. Two hundred ministers were ejected on one day, and as if the difficulty were not great enough one hundred and fifty more were turned out for refusing to attend the Synod. The large diocese of Glasgow was almost denuded of its ministers, and only after this was done did Fairfoul begin to consider how the vacancies were to be filled. To do them justice Sharp and most of the bishops deplored the insensate folly of their colleague, but the mischief done was irreparable.

Gilbert Burnet's opinion of the deprived ministers is not very high.

"They were," he says, "generally little men that had "narrow souls and low notions...a sour and supercilious sort "of people. They had little learning among them. Their "way of preaching was plain and intelligible but very dull."

On the other hand he bears ample testimony to the purity of their lives and the faithfulness of their ministry, acknowledging "that they were held in great esteem by the "people." In short, he had little sympathy with the principles on which the ministers had acted, but he condemns the way in which they had been treated.

The supplying of the vacant parishes with ministers was now the problem set before the Church. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the attention of the king's ministers should have been attracted to the brilliant young Aberdonian, the son of their late colleague, who was in a position to take immediate orders.

"At that time," he writes, "the Chancellor Glencairn "sent for me and obliged me to be oft with him. He also "made me acquainted with Mackenzie, known best in Scot- "land as Lord Tarbert, for he was a Judge, or as we call them "a Lord of the Session. He was a man of very fine notions "and had the beginnings of very valuable parts of learning "so I delighted much in his company. But I soon grew "weary of Glencairn for he was dull and haughty. They "both pressed me much to accept a benefice in the west but "I thank God that preserved me from it."

It was well for Burnet that he had the good sense to refuse. The indignation of the people of the west of Scotland at the ejection of their former ministers was so fierce and strong that no Episcopal incumbent had any chance of success in parish work. Congregations could only be procured with the help of dragoons.

Burnet wisely remained in Edinburgh, pursuing his private studies and extending the circle of his acquaintances and friends. Among the latter was already included the Earl of Kincardine, one of the ablest noblemen and one of the most interesting Scotsmen of the day. He was a sincerely religious man, who took a keen interest in Church affairs. He opposed the introduction of Episcopacy and afterwards did his best for toleration. Burnet's elder brother Thomas (already marked as a rising physician) married in 1662 a relative of this nobleman. It was probably this marriage that procured for Gilbert the friendship of Kincardine himself, whose character is thus described in the History:

"He was both the wisest and one of the worthiest men "that belonged to his country.... His thoughts went slow, and "his words came much slower, but a deep judgment appeared "in everything he said or did. He had a noble zeal for "justice, in which even friendship could never bias him. He "had solid principles of religion and virtue, which showed

"themselves with great lustre on all occasions. He was a "faithful friend and a merciful enemy. I may perhaps be "inclined to carry his character too far; for he was the first "man that entered into friendship with me. We continued "for seventeen years in so entire a friendship that there never "was even reserve or mistake between us all the while till "his death, and it was from him that I understood the whole "secret of affairs: for he was trusted with everything."

Burnet was indeed fortunate in gaining for a friend this highly gifted nobleman, a man of such excellent character. Kincardine, as we see from his letters, was not blind to Burnet's faults, but he had a genuine affection for, and took a deep interest in the young minister. With such introductions, as well as his own brilliant attainments and conversational powers, it is not wonderful that Gilbert Burnet rapidly became one of the favourites of Edinburgh society, a fact which he comments on in his own inimitable fashion:

"Now I began to be known to great men, and have "ever since been much in their company, which has brought "much envy and censure upon me from other clergymen, who "fancied that I used odd arts to compass it. But I can give "no other account of that matter but this. I never sought "the acquaintance of a great man in my whole life, but "have often declined it. Many loved me for my father's "sake, and I had a facetiousness and easiness in conversation "that was entertaining; I had read a variety of things and "could dress them in easy words, so that many liked my "company. I never imposed it on any, but I do not deny "that I had great vanity in finding my company so much "desired. I talked much and was in many things very "foolish and very faulty, yet I began early to set myself to "serve all people that were low in affliction."

The egotism of Burnet was to be a subject of endless raillery for his Jacobite enemies. It is only fair to note that though never blind to his own good qualities, he, unlike most egotists, was quite alive to his faults and reveals them with refreshing candour.

But his friends and acquaintances did not belong to one sex. About this time he formed the first of his many friendships among the distinguished women of the day.

His popularity in this respect though attributed by ill-natured contemporaries to the attractions of a handsome person and engaging manners, may be more truly and more charitably ascribed to the fact that women saw him almost exclusively in his best aspect, as director, preacher, and friend. Of these friendships the earliest and perhaps one of the most important was with the Dowager-Countess of Balcarres, who afterwards became the wife of the ninth Earl of Argyll.

"Both her lord and she" (Burnet writes) "had a great "value for my father, and she, having heard no ill things of "me, sent for me, and we grew soon acquainted. I found "her a woman of great piety and worth. She was not "bigoted to Presbytery, though she liked it better than "Episcopacy. She has a fine understanding, and a pleasant "temper, and having lived almost ten years in the Court, "she could talk of many things that were quite new to me. "In short, though I have found since that she was mistaken "in many things, yet the great conversation I had with her "this winter was a very good preparation for my journey to "London next year."

By this lady, Burnet was introduced to Lord Lorn (her future husband), who had just been reprieved from his first iniquitous condemnation to death, but was still a prisoner in Edinburgh Castle. On this distinguished but unfortunate nobleman Burnet waited often during the winter. The trial and sentence of Lorn had caused an outburst of popular indignation, and Burnet evidently shared in this, for he describes Lorn "as certainly born to be the signalest "example in this age of the rigour, or rather of the mockery "of justice."

Such experiences, so early begun, gave Burnet the best opportunities for acquiring gradually that intimate and accurate knowledge of the men and the political events of the day of which he made such effective use in his *History of his own times.*

But meanwhile the affairs of his home life were not proceeding so smoothly. All the members of the household but himself, he tells us, "were indiscreetly Presbyterian," and the events of the winter months had furnished them with grievances in abundance. The bishop's hand had

fallen heavily on Edinburgh. Every minister, with one exception (derisively nicknamed "the nest egg"), left his church rather than conform. Nairn, Burnet's friend, did conform, but thought it prudent to bow before the popular indignation, and retired to Bolton, a small parish in Haddingtonshire. The sympathy of the people was strongly with the ejected ministers. No doubt Gilbert heard from his family more than he cared about his own defection and the tyranny of his party. We are not surprised to learn that his position at home became very uncomfortable. "These things," he says, "cast me into a "deep melancholy. I spent whole days in silence and "devotion, and the nights were tedious to me." He sought relief in the study of mathematics, under the guidance of George Keith, a distinguished fellow-student of Burnet's in Aberdeen University. He also read the works of the early Christian Fathers, and "went through the tomes of the "councils in a series down to the Second Nicene Council."

The reading of these books did not make him more inclined to approve of the actions of the Scottish bishops.

"I took up then," he says, "such notions as I could "never since that time lay down. I grew to hate all opinions "that tended to raise the wealth and the secular power of "the clergy, and insensibly came to love a monastic state of "life. I hated our contentions at home, and my melancholy "prevailed so upon me that nothing but clear and strong "principles could have preserved me from going over to "the Church of Rome, and entering into a religious order."

But Burnet neither became a monk, nor joined the Church of Rome. He did something more in accordance with his own healthy Scotch nature. He wrote a letter to Archbishop Sharp, expressing himself very plainly about the evils he saw in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

"I writ," he says, "an unsubscribed letter to Sharp, "setting before him the miserable state in which we were "falling, and begged him to think on something to heal our "breaches, and to settle us again. I sent it by my man, who "did not come away so quick, but he was examined, and "owned that he came from me. Sharp bid him tell me he "would be glad to speak with me, so two days after I went "to him. I had never seen him before. I kneeled for his

"blessing, so by that he saw I was Episcopal. He treated "me roughly, and asked what I had to propose for the "settlement or government of the Church. I told him "remedies could easily be found out, if there was once a "disposition to seek for them. But being pressed by him to "offer somewhat, I proposed the suffering all the Presby- "terians to return to such Churches as were not yet planted, "and then seeking expedients for keeping matters in some "unity, till they should die out, and in the meanwhile to be "taking care of a good breed. He grew a little calm at "last, and told me that young men understood not govern- "ment, and ought not to meddle in it. He believed I had "good intentions, and charged me not to talk of that which "passed between us to any person, and so dismissed me "with some civilities."

The good-natured contempt with which the archbishop rejected the advice of the youthful reformer was perhaps to be expected. The letter, however, is an admirable illustration of the naïve presumption and shrewd common sense, both of which were prominent features in the character of Burnet. It was his first attempt, we shall see that it was not his last, to secure some toleration for the Presbyterians, to whose policy he was strongly opposed. Burnet's own comment on the wisdom of this step, written twenty years after in a mood of temporary depression, is as follows:

"I confess a disease had now got into my mind which "held me above ten years. It was an opinion I had that "mankind was capable of amendment, and that Churches "and churchmen could be reformed, and that abuses might "be so laid open that they should grow generally odious to "all the world. With these things I pleased as well as "vexed myself very long, and I made it my chief business "in the study of antiquity to pick up anything that might "fortify these notions, and I have had many discourses with "Bishop Leighton concerning them, who had heat enough "that way. Mr Charteris had always the true notion of this "matter, that it was a vain thing to dream of mending the "world, and chiefly that which was generally the worst part "of it, I mean churchmen, so that all that a wise or good "man ought to do was to possess his own mind with good "notions and to infuse them in some few individuals that

"were prepared for them, or were capable of them, and "that it was fruitless labour to hope to propagate them to "the world, or to do any good on great numbers. But these "things did not cool me. Time and experience have at "last done it, for I have now for many years laid down all "these thoughts upon which I had formerly raised many "schemes, and formed many models."

These words, so very unlike in spirit to the cheerful confidence and optimism of Burnet, were probably written in the despondent days that succeeded the Rye House Plot. He thought that he had finally and irrevocably resolved to go into retirement, and take no more interest in public affairs. It was a resolve that he often made, but never kept.

But early in 1663 an event took place which diverted the attention of Burnet from the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland, and occasioned his first visit to England. His uncle, Sir Archibald Johnston, Lord Warriston, had been living on the Continent since the Restoration, watched with ceaseless vigilance by the agents of the king. Unfortunately for himself he ventured into France, and was immediately arrested at Rouen. He was conveyed to London, and imprisoned in the Tower for six months. When the news reached Edinburgh, Burnet, at the earnest entreaty of his mother, proceeded to London, to do what he could in his uncle's behalf, and give all possible assistance and comfort to poor Lady Warriston. On his arrival he found little could be done. He appealed to Lauderdale and Middleton, old friends and comrades of Warriston's, but both firmly declined to plead for one whom the king hated so cordially. "We solicited," says Burnet, "all the hungry courtiers. Many that had a great mind to "our money, tried what could be done, but they all found "it was a thing too big for them to meddle with."

The utter hopelessness of the attempt to obtain the mercy of the king soon became too evident.

One of the letters of introduction which Burnet had brought to London was from the Countess of Balcarres to Sir Robert Moray, her late husband's brother-in-law. This exceptionally gifted man, who looks so strangely out of place in the Court of Charles II, was one of the most

interesting, and one of the best Scotchmen of that day. An able and moderate statesman, of brilliant intellect, fascinating manners and good life, he exercised an excellent influence on Lauderdale during the early years of his administration. The following portrait which Burnet draws of him is not too highly coloured.

"He was a pious man, and in the midst of armies and "courts he spent many hours a day in a devotion which was "of a most elevating strain....He was the first former of the "Royal Society, and its first President, and while he lived "he was the life and soul of that body. He had an equality "of temper in him that nothing could alter, and was in "practice the only Stoic I ever knew....He had a most "diffused love to all mankind, and he delighted in every "occasion of doing good, which he managed with great "discretion and zeal. He had the plainest, and withal the "softest way of reproving, chiefly, young people for their "faults....I have ever reckoned that next to my father "I owed more to him than any other man."

It says much for the character of Burnet that he won this good man's sincere liking and lifelong friendship. Moray took the deepest interest in the welfare of his young fellow-countrymen. He recognised the good qualities, and also the faults of Burnet, as the latter acknowledges with his usual candour.

"His greatest act of kindness to me was in reproving "what he saw was amiss in me; which was too much talk, "and a bold way of speaking, a readiness to censure others, "to set a value on myself, and to affect to talk eloquently. "Of this last he cured me quite, and shewed me how far "plain simple reason was beyond all laboured stuff, but my "other faults were too deeply rooted to be soon cured."

Probably it was to his mother's friends that Burnet owed his introduction to Patrick Drummond, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who had been settled in London for ten years. He had been the representative of the Remonstrants, or Protesters, in their dealings with the English Presbyterians during the Commonwealth, and had rendered great services to Lauderdale and Crauford during their imprisonment. He had also been the friend and confidant of Archbishop Sharp before his defection.

Probably it was from him that Burnet derived particulars of Sharp's treachery, which was specially evident in his dealings with Drummond.

Of this old Protester Burnet writes:

"He was a generous and worthy man and set himself "much to do good. His heart was full of religion. He was "free of all superstition and bigotry, and saw through the "errors and follies of all parties. He was a man of great "understanding, and of a true judgment. He likewise took "me to task, for he was morose, and used to chide me for "my faults a little too much, and indeed they both (*i.e.* "Drummond and Moray) took as much pains to form me "right as if I had been their brother, which was an invalu- "able blessing to me."

As Burnet could do nothing for Warriston, and was denied admission to the Tower till May[1], he devoted the months of waiting to the study of the ecclesiastical condition of England. On St Bartholomew's Day, 1662, two thousand ministers, who had been appointed during the Commonwealth, had been turned out of their benefices. Episcopacy had again been firmly established. Burnet accordingly set himself to know ministers of all parties, and to examine both sides of the question. He was not attracted by "the high episcopal men," but he was greatly impressed by Whichcote, the famous preacher at St Anne's, Blackfriars. He became acquainted with Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Wilkins.

"They were very free with me," he says, "and I easily "went into the notions of the Latitudinarians."

Among the Presbyterians he was specially interested in Richard Baxter, to whom he had been recommended (probably by Lady Balcarres), and from whose books he had derived much benefit. "I was often with him," he says. "He seemed very serious in the great matters of "religion, and very moderate in the points of conformity, but "I perceived he was credulous, and easily heated by those "who came about him." With Dr Manton, "the prelate of

[1] May 19th, 1663. Warrant to the Lieutenant of the Tower to allow Lady Warriston, Mrs English, and Gilbert Burnet, to have access to Lord Warriston, but only at the point of his transportation, and in the presence of the Lieutenant. *Domestic State Papers*, entry Bk 15, p. 20.

"the Presbyterians," he was less pleased. "He seemed "to be too full of intrigues, and was a more artificial man."

Burnet also spent some time at Cambridge University, where he was much charmed by the candour and philosophic temper of Dr More, "the famous Christian Platonist." "I shall never forget," he says, "one saying of his with "relation to the disputes then on foot concerning Church "government and ritual. He said none of these things "were so good as to make men good, nor so bad as to "make men bad, but might be either good or bad, according "to the hands into which they fell."

From Cambridge he proceeded to Oxford, where he found ecclesiastical learning more in request. "There," he says, "my study of antiquity (I being then so young) "did me much service, or rather, it advanced my vanity. "I was much delighted with the spirit I saw in Dr Fell and "Dr Allestry, who were two of the devoutest men I saw in "England. They were much mortified to the world, and "fasted and prayed much, only they were too hot, as I "thought, in some little matters. My declaring for Lauder-"dale, and my being much with Dr Wallis [the celebrated "mathematician], to whom Sir Robert Moray commended "me, made me pass for a Presbyterian with them, so they "were reserved to me, or perhaps they looked upon me as "a vain, confident boy who had a little knowledge and a "vast deal of pride. From the universities I returned to "London, where I needed some of the mortifications that "my two friends gave me."

He carried with him an introduction from Dr Wallis to the famous Robert Boyle, the founder of modern chemistry.

With him, he tells us, "I lived ever after to his dying "day in a close and entire friendship. He had the purity "of an angel in him, and was modest and humble rather to "a fault. He was perhaps too eager in the pursuit of "knowledge, but his aim in it all was to raise in him a higher "sense of the wisdom and glory of the Creator. He studied "the Scripture with great application, and practised universal "love and goodness. He was a declared enemy to all "bitterness, and most particularly to all persecution, on "the account of religion."

Burnet returned to Scotland in June, 1663, in the company of Lady Warriston, who followed her unfortunate husband. A great change had taken place in the administration. The rule of Middleton was over. He had tried to oust Lauderdale from the Royal favour, and had been defeated by his abler rival. The Earl of Rothes, a creature of Lauderdale's, had been appointed Lord High Commissioner, and Lauderdale himself, leaving Sir Robert Moray as his deputy in London, had come north to supervise the Parliament which he was to make his tool for many years. It was before this Parliament that Warriston appeared to receive his doom. It is true that Scotland, recognising how much the great Covenanting lawyer did for her civil and religious liberty, has been inclined to forget his faults, but it must be confessed that according to the laws and the principles of the Restoration Warriston's fate was inevitable. He had been a very prominent leader in the National League and Covenant of 1638, and of the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643. It was the irony of fate that most of those who sat in judgment on him had been his aiders and abettors in these matters. But we must remember that he had done more than this. He had been the leader of the Remonstrants, the extreme and factious party that had weakened and ruined the attempt of the Scotch to place Charles II on the throne. The King had shewn his relentless hatred of this party by the execution of Argyll and Guthrie. And Warriston had been a greater offender than they. No man had been more outspoken in his criticism of the king's faults. His remarks were possibly true enough, but were not on that account more easily forgotten by such a man as Charles II. Above all, Warriston, with much reluctance it is true, still had consented to join the administration of Cromwell, and had taken a prominent part in the Government. If a general indemnity were not passed, then no Scotsman was a greater offender than Warriston. Such men as he always appear in a religious crisis, never sparing, and when the reaction comes, never spared. Enfeebled by his long imprisonment, the stern Protester, to the surprise of all, completely broke down when he appeared before Parliament, and abjectly cried for mercy. But he quickly recovered himself, and

received his sentence with composure and dignity. Burnet tried hard to obtain a reprieve. He "forced" Lauderdale, as the latter puts it, to write a few lines in the condemned man's favour to Sir Robert Moray, which the family sent to London by post, but Lauderdale rendered the attempt useless, promptly retracting his letter by the next express. Burnet attended his uncle most assiduously to the last, and walked with him to the scaffold, where Warriston bravely met his fate. Though Burnet had little sympathy with his uncle's views, not unnaturally the event made a deep impression on him. Twenty-three years later, as we shall have occasion to observe, there was passed on him, while an exile in Holland, the very same sentence, and it is not perhaps surprising that he should have laid weight on this incident, which his enemies were ever ready to ridicule.

In the same Session Parliament passed the Conventicle Act. The deprived Presbyterian ministers had continued to preach in their parishes, though no longer in the churches, and the people had flocked to these services, leaving the churches empty. The Act forbade these conventicles, as they were called. Ministers who conducted them were to be treated as seditious persons, and all who refused to attend the parish churches were to be fined. This Act, so novel a plan for securing congregations, was humorously called the Bishops' Drag-net.

It was shortly after the execution of Warriston that Burnet entered into closer relations with the statesman who has earned such an unenviable notoriety, and made himself detested by his fellow-countrymen in a degree that few men have achieved. Lauderdale was perhaps the strangest product of that stirring and eventful age, and Burnet has left us in his *History* a vivid sketch of the appearance and character of the man.

"He made a very ill appearance; he was very big, his "hair was red, hanging oddly about him, his tongue was too "big for his mouth, which made him bedew all that he talked "to, and his whole manner was rough and boisterous, and "very unfit for a Court. He was very learned, not only "in Latin, in which he was a master, but also in Greek "and Hebrew. He had read a great deal in divinity, and "almost all historians, ancient and modern, so that he had

"great materials. He had with these an extraordinary "memory and a copious but unpolished expression. He "was a man, as the Duke of Buckingham called him to me, "of a blundering understanding, not always clear, but often "clouded, as his looks were always. He was haughty "beyond expression; abject to those he saw he must stoop "to, but imperious, insolent, and brutal to all others. He "had a violence of passion that carried him often to fits like "madness, in which he had no temper. If he took a thing "wrong it was a vain thing to study to convince him; that "would rather provoke him to swear he would never be of "another mind; he was to be let alone, and then perhaps he "would have forgot what he had said, and come about of his "own accord. He was the coldest friend and the violentest "enemy that I ever knew....He at first seemed to despise "wealth, but he delivered himself up afterwards to luxury "and sensuality, and by that means he ran into vast expense, "and stuck at nothing that was necessary to support that. "In his long imprisonment he had great impressions of "religion on his mind, but he wore out these so entirely that "scarce any trace of them was left. His great experience "in affairs, his ready compliance with everything that he "thought would please the king, and his bold offering at the "most desperate counsels gained him such an interest in the "king that no attempt against him could ever shake it, till "a decay of strength and understanding forced him to let go "his hold."

This pen-portrait Dr Airy (a great authority on the subject) has pronounced "conspicuously accurate and fair." But it ought to be pointed out that the worst features of Lauderdale's character, as described here, only revealed themselves in his most degenerate days, when he ruled Scotland in the spirit, and after the manner, of a Turkish Pasha. The signs of this degeneracy were at least not evident in 1663. At that time most people looked to Lauderdale as the man who would redress the grievances of his country. In his early days, no man had shewn more zeal for the Covenants, no man was held in higher repute among the Presbyterians. For this cause he had risked all, had ruined his estate, had suffered imprisonment, had narrowly escaped death. It is scarcely possible to

doubt the genuineness of the man's religious feeling in his early manhood, the testimony is so strong. Yet it must be confessed that the change to another course was very rapid. At the Restoration, with the cool deliberateness which only strong men shew, he decided that the sacrifices he had made for the cause of the Church were too great, and resolved to follow at any cost that policy of self-aggrandisement by which he enriched his estate, increased his power, and wrecked his reputation. The man was always strong, whether for good or evil, unquestionably the ablest and most masterful statesman in Scotland. His countrymen had recognised his powers, though his policy was still to them an enigma. Even the Presbyterians looked to him with hope, not unmixed with doubts and fears. They knew that he had strongly urged the king not to introduce Episcopacy, they knew that he was still suspected at the Court of favouring Presbyterianism, they knew that he hated and despised Archbishop Sharp. They did not know that his only policy now was to carry out every wish of the king, and thus promote his own interests. Yet, with all his selfishness, there must have been a singular charm about the man, before drink and debauchery had done their work. "My lord," wrote the Presbyterian Principal Baillie, "you are the nobleman in "the world I love best, and esteem most." Richard Baxter, the famous Puritan, had at first an equally high opinion of the man. While we shall see Lauderdale summoning to his side some of the finest and best living men in Scotland, who admired him and worked with him as long as they could conscientiously, finally leaving him, but with profound regret.

Burnet was now to feel this spell, which Lauderdale exercised so powerfully over those he met.

"I was not a little lifted up this summer," he writes, "with the civilities that Lauderdale shewed me, and I waited "on him perpetually."—Indeed, so frank was their intercourse that Burnet dared to expostulate with the all-powerful minister, as to the subservience shewn by him to the extreme Episcopal party, possibly referring to the Conventicle Act. Lauderdale's reply was extremely candid.

"He ran out," says Burnet, "into a great deal of "freedom with me. He told me a many passages about

"Sharp's life. He was persuaded that he would ruin all, "but was resolved to give him line, for he had not credit "enough to stop him. Things would run to a height, and "then the king himself would put a stop to their career."

Lauderdale was probably playing a double game. He wished to shew the king and court his zeal for Episcopacy. But at the same time, as far as Scotland was concerned, he had no objection to laying the blame of the oppressive legislation on the bishops.

It was during one of these visits to Lauderdale that Burnet first met the lady who afterwards became his wife. This was Lady Margaret Kennedy, the daughter of the Earl of Cassilis. She was Lauderdale's cousin, and so intimate a friend of his, that scandalous tongues had not failed to comment upon it. Her reply to such remarks was, "that "her virtue was above suspicion," and Sir George Mackenzie admits that "it really was, she being a person whose religion "exceeded as far her wit, as her parts exceeded others of "her sex."

This high-spirited and very accomplished lady was thirty-eight years of age when Burnet first met her—eighteen years older than himself. She was a zealous Presbyterian, and was at this time pleading earnestly with the secretary for the material interests of the unfortunate Warriston's family. Naturally enough, she would be disposed to take an interest in Warriston's nephew.

Burnet tells us in his usual frank way that at first he was not attracted by her, for he considered that she interfered with politics too much.

"I thought," says he, "that there were two sorts of "persons that ought not to meddle in affairs, though upon "very different accounts. These were churchmen and "women. We ought to be above it, and women were "below it."

This remark is ridiculous enough when we consider Burnet's own career.

But he goes on, "from a general acquaintance there "grew a great friendship between us. She was generous to "a high degree, and was a noble friend and a very tender-"hearted woman to all in misery, and sincere, even to a "nicety."

At this time Burnet also made the acquaintance of

Mr Scougal, then the minister of Saltoun, afterwards the pious Bishop of Aberdeen.

"As I was one day standing with him on the streets of "Edinburgh," he says, "a gentleman of a pale countenance "and in a very plain garb came to us and made me a great "compliment in acknowledgment of the kindness he had "received from my father at Paris. I thought he was some "ordinary man, and did not much mind his compliment, but "we went on in our discourse, and he happened to say some "things that discovered both great learning and much sense. "So I asked who it was, and found it was Sir Robert "Fletcher [of Saltoun]....We had a great deal of discourse, "and I had the luck to please him ; at which I wonder much, "for he was one of the humblest and modestest men in the "world, and I was then one of the vainest and insolentest. "His genius lay to mathematics and philosophy, and he "wanted a friend and companion in study, so he began to "resolve on having me about him."

Burnet's home-life at this time was not peaceful. The fate of her brother had increased, if possible, Mrs Burnet's hatred of the Episcopal party, and the family were still strongly opposed to his entering the Church.

"I had many sad things said to me on that subject," he tells us. "And my mother laid it so to heart, that it "put her into fits, so that we thought she would have died of "them. Therefore, to give her some content, I promised "not to take orders yet for a year, and so we were more at "ease."

At Christmas, Burnet went to Yester in Haddingtonshire, on a visit to the Earl of Tweeddale. Of this excellent nobleman, the consistent advocate of tolerance, the only man in the Scotch Parliament who dared to vote against the unjust sentence on James Guthrie, he has left us the following account :

"He was early engaged in [public] business, and "continued in it to a great age. He understood all the "interests and concerns of Scotland well. He had a great "stock of knowledge, with a mild and obliging temper. He "was of a blameless, or rather exemplary life in all respects. "He had loose thoughts, both of civil and ecclesiastical "government, and seemed to think that what form soever

"was uppermost, was to be complied with...though he was "in all other respects the ablest and worthiest of the nobility, "only he was too cautious and fearful."

At the house of this nobleman, Burnet met his two friends Charteris, the minister of Yester, and Nairn, minister of the neighbouring parish of Bolton. Burnet preached in the parish church on Sunday, and never forgot the experience that followed.

"It was," he says, "the first time that Mr Charteris had "heard me. He is a very modest man, and was sorry to "find that some good things which he fancied he saw in me "were like to be spoiled with pride and arrogance, and "being resolved to say something, and yet being restrained "by his modesty, he did it in a more effectual way."

Charteris told him the legend of Thauler the mystic's conversion from self-sufficient arrogance to evangelical humility.

"I heard him," writes Burnet many years after, "with "such attention, that I think I remember yet the very words "he used, the stops he made, his looks and gestures are yet "fresh in my mind; and it had such an effect on me that "there was never anything befell me in my whole life that "touched me more....I have been often since that time on "the point of coming down out of the pulpit, or of breaking "off in the middle, when I have felt violent temptations to "vanity seize on me. And I have seldom preached on extra-"ordinary occasions, before which I have not very heartily "prayed, that if the rubbing shame on me, by my miscarriage "in it, might contribute more to the honour of God than my "performing well, that God's will might be done. I confess "I have had another notion of preaching ever since that "time. Till then I had only thought on a laboured and "adorned discourse, for which I might be much applauded, "but from henceforth I have conceived that the true end of "preaching was to give men plain and easy notions of re-"ligion, and to beget in them tender and warm affections."

One of the visitors at Yester House was Sir Robert Fletcher, who lived four miles distant. Burnet accepted his invitation to Saltoun, and during his stay preached twice in the parish church. The minister of the parish was Mr Scougal, and his nephew, John Cockburn, who was living

at the Manse, gives the following amusing account of Burnet's visit:

"About this time I saw him first, for I remember well he "came to my uncle's house at Saltoun, on a Tuesday morning, "just as my uncle was going out of doors to Church to preach "the weekly lecture. Mr Nairn and Mr Charteris were "with him. Upon the first motion, he put on the gown, and "eased my uncle of that day's exercise. I remember neither "the text, nor the subject of the sermon, nor was I capable of "passing any judgment upon it, not being above ten years "old. All three abode that day and night. My uncle "having designed his second son Henry and myself for the "ministry allowed us to stay in the room, when clergymen or "scholars, from whom anything might be learned, were with "him, but we were not allowed to prate or cast in a word.... "Next day, after they were gone, my uncle went into the "garden and called me to him, saying, John, do not you "admire this young man, and do not you aspire to be like "him, who as yet, is not above twenty-one, and is a scholar "and a preacher, and has travelled England, France[1] and "Holland? To this I answered rashly No, sir, I have no "desire to be like him, for I think him a fool. My uncle "turned about, and gave me a gentle flap on the face, and "said with an angry countenance, How now, who taught "you to speak so saucily of your betters? But come, tell "me what makes you say and think so. Then somewhat "dejected, I said, Sir, there were three of you there whom "all the country stands in awe of. I never saw any who "did not observe a reverend distance from every one of you, "and seemed afraid to speak in your presence. But he "talked all the time, and did not suffer any of you to speak "a dozen of words, and he rambled from one thing to "another, and he spake several things that looked like old "women's tales, as of a strange sort of people, whom he "called, the Rosycrucians, whom I never heard of before.... "My uncle made no reply, neither, as was usual, did correct "my observations, upon which I took a little heart, and "hoped he was not so angry as he seemed."

How much of this account is mythical it is difficult to

[1] This is a mistake of Cockburn's. Burnet had not been on the Continent before this time.

say. Cockburn did not love Burnet, and wrote his narrative sixty years after the visit. But it is evident that others were more favourably impressed than the ten-year old critic. The parish of Saltoun was about to become vacant, the minister being appointed to the Bishopric of Aberdeen. Sir Robert Fletcher, acting on the advice of Mr Scougal (as Cockburn acknowledges), presented Burnet with the living. The offer came to Burnet as a great surprise. "I had," he writes, "moved the Earl of Tweeddale to propose Mr Nairn, "and then I had resolved to come into Mr Nairn's living. "But he [Sir Robert] declined the motion, at which "Tweeddale was amazed, for there was not such another as "Nairn to be found. The excuse he made was, he knew "Nairn would be quickly pulled from him. And when "I pressed him further for Nairn, he repeated what he had "told Tweeddale, and added, that my inclination to philo-"sophy and mathematics made him prefer me. I told him "I intended to travel. He said it was so much the better, "I would be more improved by it, and Bishop Scougal was "not to remove for six months, so I might accomplish it."

In the course of the following February Burnet set out on his travels. On his arrival in London he was received with the greatest kindness by Sir Robert Moray, through whose influence he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society (March 26, 1664), an honour of which he was justly proud. Two months later he crossed to Rotterdam. He met there many Scottish exiles, but was unfavourably impressed "by their intolerable peevishness and ill-nature.' Thence he proceeded to Amsterdam, where he spent six weeks devoted to the study of Hebrew, under the tuition of a learned Jew, and also to inquiring into the tenets of the numerous religious sects. He became acquainted with Arminians, Lutherans, Anabaptists, Brownists, Papists, and Unitarians, and found in all these religious bodies, "some "men who were so good that he was not a little confirmed "in his resolution never to go in for persecution."

He was charmed with the toleration he saw in Holland, so different from the condition of his own country. "For," he tells us, "there was only a difference of opinion among "them, but no heat or anger raised by it, everyone enjoying "his own conscience."

The high opinion he formed of the Arminians at this early stage in his career is very significant when we remember his later theological position, "They, *i.e.* the "Arminians," he says, "were the men I saw in all Holland "of the clearest heads and the best tempers; they had an "excellent sense of the practical parts of religion (particularly "of love and peace), and expressed great readiness to re-unite "with the Calvinists whenever they should come to cease "imposing their doctrines upon them; and thought that in "these, and many other points, there ought to be more "mutual forbearance. This they extended even to the "Socinians; but they assured me they were not Socinians "themselves, yet they did not like the subtleties of the fathers "and of the schoolmen in mysterious points. I was likewise "acquainted with the Socinians, in particular with Zuicker "the author of Irenicon Irenicorum. He was a man of clear "thoughts and very composed, and was indeed the devoutest "man I saw in Holland....He was against the doctrine of "the Trinity, but did believe that Christ's death was a "sacrifice for our sins. I knew likewise the Brownists and "Menonists or Anabaptists, who were divided into many "little fractions."

From what he saw of the Dutch sects, he came to the following conclusion:—"One thing I drank deep in, at "Amsterdam (which sticks still with me and is not like to "leave me), which is never to form a prejudice in my mind "against any man because he is of this or that persuasion; "for I saw many men of all persuasions that were as far as "I could perceive so truly religious that I never think the "worse of a man for his opinions. Education is all, to men "of weak heads: they never examine the first principles that "were infused in them, nor were it fit to put them upon it; "for they, believing all alike, if they began to doubt of "some things, that would carry them to doubt of others, and "so they would not stop perhaps till they might run too far."

He spent some time at Leyden and the Hague, where at the request of Sir Robert Fletcher he studied the mechanical inventions of the Dutch, in this respect so far before his own countrymen. He also gave much attention to the government of Holland and, stout royalist as he was, confesses how favourably he was impressed with the condition of the republic.

What delighted him most was "the care that was taken "of the poor in so liberal and plentiful a manner, and the "method in which this was managed, without partiality, or "regard to a man's religion."

He next proceeded to France through the Spanish Netherlands. He saw many things but did not make the acquaintance of any considerable persons in Flanders, for, as he naïvely remarks, "many Scotchmen were travelling "with me, and they might have made stories in Scotland, "if I had conversed much or freely with any Papists. But "at Paris I was more at liberty."

From Sir Robert Moray, who had been engaged in political correspondence with the leaders of French Protestantism, he bore an introduction to Morus, a famous protestant minister. Moray had advised Burnet strongly to pay special attention to the elocution of the French preachers, "for he thought if our English sermons were "pronounced, as the French did theirs, preaching would be "at great perfection amongst us."

Morus received the young Scotchman with great kindness, as Burnet cordially acknowledges, but neither seems to have greatly liked the other. The witty Frenchman told Burnet "that he was too enthusiastical and would "become hypochondriacal," while Burnet was afraid "that "Morus had too much levity in his mind, and was too near "a libertine," *i.e.* a free-thinker.

It is not surprising then, that Burnet admired the delivery of the French preacher's sermons more than the matter. "He had," he says, "an inimitable fire, with a great "variety of thoughts that lay out of the common road, that "both surprised and pleased his audience. He looked like "one inspired, but he had too much of the stage in his way, "and those flights that passed well in a pathetic discourse "could not bear a strict examination. I was much improved "in my style of preaching by what I saw in him, and found "a great deal to imitate and correct."

On the whole Burnet was not favourably impressed with what he saw of the Huguenots.

"I confess," he says, "I thought the French Protestants "had no great sense of devotion and did not imagine that "they would have stuck to their religion."

He did not like the preaching of the Jesuits or the

friars, "It had too much of the stage in it." But the secular priests pleased him better. "They preached," he says, "more staidly and more like men that were all the "while thinking of what they were saying, I took a good "tincture of that way indeed, more than Scotland could "well bear, and much more than England could endure. "But I have worn off some gestures that looked too like "acting, and yet the way of preaching, which I still hold "(as some that have observed it well have told me), is very "like the way of the secular clergy of Port Royal."

He saw little to admire in French Romanism or the monastic systems. He visited many monasteries. He was also allowed to converse with several nuns "at grates," specially with the daughter of Lady Balcarres. This young lady was a convert to Romanism and had taken the veil, but she had grown weary of the nun's life and wished to escape. She and Burnet formed a plan for this, which, however, came to nothing.

After six weeks stay in Paris he returned to England. "I had," he says, "made some improvement by this short "ramble, so I did not stick to talk of it enough to weary "those that fell in my way."

He stayed three months longer in England, and during this time he studied Oughtred's Algebra—the text-book of the day—under a tutor. He returned to Scotland probably about the end of September. A few days after his arrival in Edinburgh, Sir Robert Fletcher came to convey him to Saltoun. Fletcher delighted in mathematical study, but had not yet mastered algebra.

"He was," says Burnet, "an humble, good and worthy "man. He had a great love of learning, and had made con-"siderable progress in it, and his two eldest sons were then "under a very exact education, and in the years most capable "of it, so he intended that I should live in the house with "him, and assist both himself in his own studies, and his "sons' tutor in instructing them."

Burnet evidently preached every Sunday from the 9th of October in Saltoun Church, though he was not ordained till February. Why he did not at once become the parish minister, though he lived in the parish, will appear in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

LIFE AND WORK IN SALTOUN.

The Act of May 27th, 1662, to use Burnet's quaint words, "set Episcopacy on another bottom than it had ever "been on in Scotland before." The bishops were no longer, as in the first episcopate, merely the presidents of the Church Courts with a negative voice, but were now vested with the whole government and jurisdiction of the church. Diocesan synods were legally established on December 10th of the same year. The Presbyteries, however, had no legal standing, though it was found necessary to revive them for the work of the church. They discharged all their former functions with the exception of ordination, but as they were wholly dependent on the will of the Bishops, the Covenanters nicknamed them "meetings of the Bishops' "Committee." One of their duties was to examine any minister who had been presented to a parish within the bounds of the Presbytery, and this examination was no mere form.

At a meeting of the Presbytery of Haddington on 10th December, 1664, a letter was read from the Bishop of Edinburgh stating "that Mr Gilbert Burnet had received "letters of presentation from the Kings Majestie and withal "desiring the Presbyterie to hasten his tryalls." These trials were concluded on December 15th, "when the "Presbyterie appointed him to have a testimonial of their "approbation of him." He did not, however, take orders till February, for he wished the people of Saltoun also to give their consent before he became their minister.

"I continued among them," he says, "four months before "I took orders. I resolved to know all the parish and to be "known of them before I would engage myself to them.

"They all came without any one exception to me, and "desired me to labour among them." Those who know how eager the Scotch people have always been to have some voice in the choice of their minister, will appreciate the prudence of Burnet's conduct.

Before the ordination took place, however, he had to mourn the loss of his friend and patron, Sir R. Fletcher. "A melancholy accident happened," he writes, "that took "out of my way the greatest diversion that seemed to lie "before me. That winter a great comet appeared and we "[Sir Robert Fletcher and Burnet] observed it many nights. "This had so ill an effect on him that it brought a fever on "him of which he died," on January 13th, 1665.

Burnet preached the funeral sermon, and immediately rushed into print, publishing his sermon (so his enemies declared) without consulting the relatives or friends of the deceased. His text was 2 Sam. iii. 38, and the title was "A Discourse on the memory of that rare and truly virtuous "person Sir Robert Fletcher of Saltoun." It was not a great sermon and is well described by the author himself as "the rude essay of an unpolisht hand." That it is still extant is possibly due to that persistent malignity with which the Jacobites followed Burnet during his life and strove to ridicule his memory. Sixty years after, Cockburn (one of the most moderate of them) writes:—"It was a truly "juvenile performance, the language bombast, full of affected "words and phrases, and in describing Sir Robert he did "not give his proper character, but an imaginary idea of his "own brain. He reflected on other Quality calling them a "bedwarfed gentry. Sir Andrew Fletcher, brother to Sir "Robert, was very much disgusted with the sermon, but "more at the printing of it, and therefore sent to take up all "the copies giving as his reason, 'That it was well-known "that his brother was a well-bred gentleman, but Burnet "had represented him as a pitiful narrow souled pedant.'"

Dr Stratford goes even further than Cockburn, and maintains that the publication "was designed to make his "court to Fletcher's widow."

This virulent criticism of the sermon of a minister of twenty-one is really not deserved. Pretentious phrasing and too great display of learning are common faults of a young

preacher. In reality the sermon gives a description of Sir Robert's character of which his friends need not have been ashamed. It describes Sir Robert's love of mathematics and natural philosophy, his belief that the progress of science would work for the advance of religion. It speaks of his piety and devotion, mentioning that he sometimes gave up eight hours of the day to religious exercise. It tells how "his spirit was too large to shrink into the narrow "orb of party or interest. He judged none of our debates "to be of matters essential to religion and howbeit he was "of opinion that episcopal government moderating over, but "regulated by Presbytery, might have as strong a plea for "the chair as any form, yet he judged forms to be of them-"selves indifferent, and almost his last prayer was for the "unity of the church." On this topic Burnet dilates, "We "are become too keen on trivial disputes...the great and "indispensable precepts of the law of Jesus, holiness, charity "and obedience are counted but mean and sorry doctrine."

Gilbert Burnet was fortunate in the county in which he began his ministry. The establishment of Episcopacy had not greatly disturbed the Presbytery of Haddington. Two of the parishes were vacant. The ministers of Athelstaneford and Tranent did not conform, but being old men were allowed to die undisturbed. Their assistants, however, who were of the same persuasion, were promptly ejected. The minister of Bolton had fled to Ireland to seek greater ecclesiastical freedom, and was succeeded by Burnet's friend Nairn. The minister of Dirleton and one of the ministers of Haddington would not conform, but through the influence of Lauderdale were allowed to retain their livings. The other nine ministers acquiesced in the change, and they were men of whom any church might be proud. The Presbytery seemed to be a veritable nursery for bishops. Scougal became bishop of Aberdeen, and during the next ten years no less than three members of the Presbytery had said "Nolo episcopari," wisely declining the dangerous eminence. Two of their number became professors of Theology in the Scotch Universities, while of the six "Bishop's Evangelists," who were eventually sent to convert the stubborn west, five either had been or were members of the Presbytery of Haddington. In his new home Burnet

was surrounded by friends. Nairn and Charteris were in neighbouring parishes. The Earl of Tweeddale was only four miles distant, while Burnet's cousin, Lady Hepburn, a daughter of Warriston, lived in the adjacent parish of Humbie.

It was under a deep sense of responsibility that Burnet entered on his ministry.

"I knew," he writes, "I had a great deal to answer "for to God and the church. I had a perfect health capable "of labour and study. I had a good memory and an imagi- "nation that was but too lively. I had a copious fluency of "expression: all these nature, or rather the author of nature, "had furnished me with. I had the greatest advantages in "the progress of my life, from my first beginnings under "my Father to that day, of any man that I knew. Three "of the greatest clergymen and two of the best laymen of "the age had concurred to finish an education that was "well begun. So I had much to answer for, and though I "laboured under a load of self-conceit and vanity, yet I "thank God I had gone long under true and deep impres- "sions of religion. But I had not kept them up always in "one state, I had been often under great dissipation. I now "entered upon a more serious view of myself and of the "function to which I was to be dedicated. I resolved to "give myself wholly to it and to direct all my studies that "way."

He had been presented by the patron and examined by the Presbytery. He had also received ordination from the Bishop which qualified him to discharge all the duties of the ministry. But he was not legally the minister of Saltoun, nor could he receive stipend till he was instituted by order of the Presbytery. He seemed to be in no hurry to apply for this, for though he was ordained in February it was not till June 15th, 1665, that "Mr Laurence Charteris "was appointed to give him institution at Saltoun."

Saltoun, of which he was now minister, is a rural parish in the south-west of the county of Haddington, about 15 miles distant from Edinburgh. It is small in area, no house in the parish being more than two miles distant from the church, but in the 17th century it must have contained a population of nearly a thousand. Two county families

(the Fletchers of Saltoun and the St Clairs of Herdmanston), had their residences in the parish. The people were chiefly engaged in agriculture. The stipend of the minister was 550 merks, Scots, one chalder of wheat, one of bear or barley, and two of oatmeal, the approximate value of which would be £60—a good living in those days. The Manse (Burnet calls it the parsonage, but this term was never used in Scotland), which had been built six years before, seems to have been an exceptionally good house. Cockburn says there were few better in Scotland, while Burnet describes it as "not only convenient "but noble." In one of its rooms was a library of 150 theological books bequeathed seven years before "for the "use of the ministers of Saltoun." Outside was an excellent garden, a good glebe, and accommodation for horse and cow. In addition there was—what was considered an indispensable equipment for a minister's house before the days of tea and coffee—a brew house to brew his ale. All these buildings were maintained by the heritors or landed proprietors. In temporalities Gilbert Burnet was considered very fortunate.

The Church, which stood in the centre of the parish, had been built in pre-Reformation days, and like many of the Roman Catholic country churches was a plain building, oblong in shape, without spire or tower, in length sixty-six feet. A low stone wall divided the nave from the choir, in which were the pulpit and the seats for the gentry. There was an earthen floor, the roof was covered with "divots" (turf), there were no fixed seats or pews in the nave where the people congregated. Each worshipper had to provide a seat for himself, generally a three-legged stool. The Church must have been badly lighted, for the windows were very small, half wood, half glass; in many churches the windows were not glazed at all. If we remember how cold and draughty these old churches were we will understand a custom which would seem irreverent now. The men kept on their hats, or rather their bonnets during service. During praise the hats were generally removed; at the prayers they were drawn reverently over the face; but during the sermon all heads were covered, the preacher's included. Three bells rang on the Sunday

morning, the first to remind the people to prepare for church, the second an hour afterwards, when a catechetical service was conducted by the reader, who was generally the schoolmaster of the parish. He led the psalmody, read two chapters from the Bible, often asking questions from the young people present, and read prayers generally of Knox's Liturgy. This service usually lasted an hour, and at the close the minister entered the church and all the people who were to attend worship took their places. The praise during the service was from the metrical psalms still in use in the Scottish Church. The precentor read two lines at a time and then sang them. At the close of the last psalm of the service the Gloria Patri was sung. This usage was the only distinction between the Episcopalian and Presbyterian service, for no Scotch minister used a liturgy. It is stated in nearly every work on the Church History of Scotland that Burnet was the single exception. This is not correct. What he says is: "I was the only man "I heard of in Scotland that used the forms of Common "Prayer, not reading, but repeating them." This is a somewhat idle boast. Very probably the parishioners of Saltoun never knew that their minister borrowed his prayers from the English Service Book. Had he begun to read them there might have been trouble.

Burnet's preaching duties were not light, for he had to prepare three sermons each week—two for Sunday and one for the week-day service. As the sermons were long and had to be delivered without the help of manuscript, this duty demanded all the energies of a young minister. He resolved, however, not to try to get them by heart, but to follow the hints which he had received from Nairn.

"I read the Scripture," he says, "with great application "and got a great deal of it by heart, and accustomed myself "as I was riding or walking to repeat parcells of it. I went "through the Bible to consider all the texts proper to be "preached on, and studied to understand the literal meaning "of the words...I accustomed myself on all occasions to form "my meditations into discourse, and spoke aloud what oc- "curred to my thoughts. I went over the body of Divinity "frequently...and formed a way of explaining every part of it "in the easiest and clearest way I could, and I spent a great

"part of every day in talking over to myself my thoughts of "these matters. But that which helped me most was that "I studied to live in frequent recollection, observing myself, "and the chain of thoughts that followed all good or bad "inclinations, and thus by a course of meditation and prayer "I arrived at a great readiness in preaching that has con- "tinued ever with me from that time."

Another of his duties was to catechise or examine his parishioners in the knowledge of the Bible and the Westminster Shorter Catechism four times a year. "We cate- "chised in Scotland," he says, "all old and young, masters "of families and servants, except those whose education set "them above the suspicion of ignorance. This I did three "times a week, except in the seasons of hard labour. I "quickly brought all my parish to such a degree of knowledge "that they answered me to the sense of the questions I asked "without sticking to the words of any catechism."

Of course there were some unwilling pupils, for we find in the parish records the minister complaining "that divers "ignorant persons had absented themselves divers times "from the dyots of catechising." The Kirk Session promptly summoned the offenders, solemnly rebuked them, and "ordered them for their better instruction to stay upon the "dyots of catechism at least every third Sunday."

Burnet paid a pastoral visit to every household at least twice a year, and visited the sick every day. He administered the Lord's Supper four times each year, and "spoke to every individual person that desired to "receive it."

The congregation seems to have increased during his ministry, for the church had to be enlarged. We find a petition sent to the Presbytery by Lady Fletcher in 1665 asking permission "to build ane aile and in it a chamber "with a chimney divided by a partition from the place of "hearing whereunto Lady Saltoun and her children might "retire to refresh themselves betwixt sermons." The Bishop and Presbytery granted the request on condition that there was to be no chimney. A chimney in the church was too startling an innovation in Scotland of the 17th century, even among Episcopalians.

We have already mentioned the Kirk Session, which

was the only ecclesiastical court of the Presbyterian Church left practically unchanged in the Episcopal period. It consisted in Saltoun of the minister and fourteen elders, whose duties were to administer congregational affairs and to watch over the religious and moral condition of the parish. Burnet in his History gives an accurate account of the stern discipline of the Presbyterians. He should have stated (as he does not) that the Episcopal discipline was equally severe. In strictness, the Kirk Session of Saltoun under the moderatorship of Burnet did not come one whit behind the sternest Covenanters. In one instance we find a woman convicted of what was quaintly called "a trilapse" ordained to sit twenty-six Sundays in sackcloth on the place of repentance, and the first three Sundays to stand at the most patent door of the Kirk "in sackcloth, bair-headed, "until the third bell ended and the minister entered the "pulpit." For sixteen Sundays she obeyed, but on the sixteenth she pleaded that she was soon to get married, so the Session remitted the rest of the punishment, in the hope that marriage would improve her.

Persons were also cited for breach of the Sabbath, profaneness, drunkenness, scolding, and fighting, and dealt with severely.

Burnet and his Session were also strict enforcers of church attendance. During the service the elders were sometimes sent to search the village, and especially the public houses. One minute records this result:—"the "town being searched all were found at church except those "who were necessitat to stay at home."

Nor was this strictness exercised over the poorer classes only. We find Mr Gilbert Burnet complaining to the Presbytery "that young Hermingston" (he means Herdmanston) "never attended the church, and had ridden past "during time of service." A committee was appointed to confer with the young laird, who prudently retired to Fife.

A very important duty of the Kirk Session was that of caring for the poor, to which commendable object the church door collections were mainly devoted. The poverty of Scotland at this time was appalling, and the records of the Session reveal how faithfully and earnestly they tried to help the deserving poor. A pretty and well authenticated

story shows the generosity of the minister to those in distress. One of his parishioners, who was in execution for debt, came imploring some small relief. Burnet enquired how much would again set him up in trade, and on a sum being named, instructed his servant to pay it. "Sir, said the servant, it is all we have in the house. Well, "well, replied Burnet, give it to the poor man, you do not "know the pleasure there is in making a man glad."

The minister took a lively interest in the education of the young. There was a schoolmaster in the parish whose salary was a hundred merks (£5. 11*s.* 1*d.*), but there was no place for the children to meet except the church. Through the efforts of Burnet a school was built, not of course in accordance with modern ideas. In a sorry building, with a hole in the roof for a chimney, and holes in the wall for windows, the youth of Saltoun who sought education met. They sat on stools spelling out their books, or lay extended on the earthen floor striving to master the pen.

These parish duties did not exhaust the energies of the minister. He found time for private study, and superintended the education of the two sons of Sir Robert Fletcher, one of whom afterwards became the famous Scotch politician, Andrew Fletcher the Patriot. He also was regular in his attendance at the meetings of Presbytery, which were held at Haddington every three weeks, and for some time acted as clerk. He began a movement for converting the Papists of East Lothian, which was not very successful. But one action of his deserves to be mentioned, as showing his toleration towards his Protestant brethren. We have noted that in 1662 two Presbyterian ministers (the ministers of Dirleton and Haddington) were allowed to retain their livings. In 1665 the Bishop of Edinburgh resolved to make them conform or drive them out. The Presbytery unanimously deprecated the step, gave a high character to the threatened ministers, and sent Burnet as one of a committee of two to petition the bishop in their favour. Possibly the deputation would have done little good had not some other force been at work. The result, however, was that the ministers were allowed to work and die in their parishes. The experience of the collegiate

church of Haddington was surely unique. The people in that town actually saw what many righteous men have longed to see, an Episcopal and a Presbyterian minister alternately conducting the services of God's house under the same church roof. They could attend the service of either minister, none daring to make them afraid. And stranger still, we owe this lesson in tolerance to the influence of the much hated Lauderdale.

But if Lauderdale curbed the power of the bishops in his own domain, he either could not or would not do the same in other parts of Scotland. A most unholy alliance took place between the Earl of Rothes—the most profligate man in Scotland—and the Archbishops of St Andrews and Glasgow, Sharp and Burnet. The provisions of the Conventicle Act were enforced with the utmost rigour. The people of the southern and western counties still declined to attend church, and the triumvirate resolved to compel them. The ejected Presbyterian ministers were silenced or exiled or chased from place to place. Ruinous fines were imposed on all who refused to attend church or were present at conventicles. Those who could not pay the fines were imprisoned or whipped through the streets. Sir James Turner with a body of soldiers was sent through the country with powers to enforce church attendance, or to fine absentees without process of law. No wonder Scotland was seething with discontent.

Many of the Episcopal ministers were indignant at the high-handed proceedings of the Archbishops. Among them were Nairn, Charteris and the young minister of Saltoun. Burnet had been studying the Church of the first three centuries, and had marked the difference between the bishops of those days and the Scotch bishops. The latter "observed," he says, "none of the rules while they fetched "the chief argument for their order from these times." Full of the subject, and indignant at the mismanagement of ecclesiastical affairs, he drew up "a long and warm memorial "of all the abuses, and sent copies to all the bishops of his "acquaintance. I resolved," he says, "that no other person "should have a share in any trouble that it might bring on "me, so I communicated it to no one."

There is no reason to doubt that Burnet was alone

responsible for the memorial. Only the author himself could have dreamed of its doing any good. His friend Charteris was a pessimist who believed "that it was a vain "thing to dream of mending the world." Nairn had left the neighbourhood before the memorial was written. Had Burnet consulted them we may be sure it would never have been sent. Fortunately, the paper has been preserved, otherwise we might have been inclined to sympathise wholly with the bishops, who, Cockburn tells us, "were highly "offended that a stripling should be so insolent and take so "much upon him." But the recent discovery of the memorial[1] enables us to consider the other side of the case. To describe it as an act of youthful folly is to misrepresent it. It was an able and trenchant denunciation of the abuses which were marring the usefulness and influence of the church which Burnet loved. Presumption, self-complacency and ostentation of learning are abundantly evident, but no less so the shrewd wisdom and common sense, the honesty and fearlessness of conviction, the impetuous zeal and deep religious earnestness which made Burnet so strong a man.

He begins by asserting that what he is going to do has been done by others, with a far greater freedom, and "hath "been taken in good part by those that have pretended to "be highest in the Church." He describes the deplorable condition of the Scottish Church, "a schism forming, if "not already formed, the power of religion lost, and we "abandoned to dash one against another, profaneness daily "proving and discovering itself, atheism creeping in apace; "meanwhile an inexcusable supineness and negligence hath "overtaken the clergy."

He expresses his hearty approval of Episcopacy as the best form of Church government, and his disappointment at the result of its establishment.

"Now this excellent government is indeed restored, but "alas it is not animate with the ancient spirit. What is done "for the promoting of religion? the disturbance that the "Restitution hath occasioned is evident, but the good of it "is yet to come....What moral virtue or Christian grace is

[1] See *Miscell. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. 340—58.

"raised to any greater height for your coming in? Your "non-residence would have been judged scandalous, even by "the Council of Trent. How often have any of you visited "your diocies. It is now four years since ye were set up, "and I doubt if some of you have visited one church....Ye "should be giving them your paternal directions and ad- "monitions. Ye ought also to be searching into our con- "versations, that ye may know our faults before they be "ringing in the ears of the world. You are not Bishops that "ye may live at ease and ply the affairs of the State, ye ought "to feed the flock. Some of you preach scarce ever. Others "only when you are at your own houses, and some of you "have their dwellings without the bounds of their diocesse.... "Visit your parishes, preach often in all your churches, and "see that the people be fed by their pastors, and...and "undoubtedly the blessing of the Almighty shall attend you "in your labours."

He next speaks of the Bishops wholly engaging themselves in the affairs of State and secular business, an employment which all antiquity judged unsuitable to the clergy. "How sad it is," he says, "to hear the Bishops called "the most immoderate of all....How contrary is it to the "meek and rational spirit of the gospel to drive any into our "Society by force, or to fyne them that oppose themselves "in their Estates, because God hath darkened their under- "standings....Now I must say its pretty odd, that Papists "have masses without trouble, and are not forced to keep "church (mistake me not, as if I did disapprove of that con- "nivence), and yet the Presbyterians are tossed and harassed "if they go not to church, or meet for religious worship, since "the principles of the former are incomparably worse.... "What violent doings have we seen? turning out hundreds "of ministers, forcing scrupulous people to churches with "other barbarous actions....I do not justify the Presbyterians "in their humours, I know too many of them are schismatical "and factious, but I am confident many of them have the "fear of God before their eyes, and desire to keep a good "conscience, and might be induced to live peaceably....And "therefore they deserve compassion from all, especially from "most of yourselves, who were once in the same error (for "having taken the Covenant and persisting so long in a

"violent profession of Presbytery, you have either strangely "prevaricated or were really of that opinion)...you know "what influence, prejudice, education and a misinformed "conscience had then upon you, and say as before the Lord, "would ye have been pleased had you been used as they "are when you were of their persuasion....Now this I can "positively say, that nothing has been done in a rational "way to gain them...scarce anything but authority hath "been used to bring them in."

After protesting against some of the bishops "voting "and judging in causa sanguinis," he censures the state and grandeur they keep up.

"A bishop ought to be humble...it is hard to persuade "who see you live as you do that you are such....Your high "places, brave horses, coaches and titles savour but little of "a mortified spirit. And however by your stately garb, the "canail and sordid cattell may truckle under you...yet no "noble or generous soul will be moved thereby to esteem "you."

He accuses the bishops of enriching themselves and their families "with the goods of the Church."

"This scandal cries aloud...Bishops are making pur- "chases and great fortunes....You have impoverished the "Universities by taking your revenues from them, and the "poor ministers must be taxed for making up of this. The "blessing of God is not to be expected on an estate so "sacrilegiously acquired."

He next urges the bishops to make stricter examination of the character and qualifications of the men who enter the ministry.

"First what sordid means are used for securing presen- "tation :... Further what sorry and insignificant tryals are "those of the presbytery! Shall the bishops sit down upon "the dregs of the presbyterians, and rise no higher with their "reforme? Shall a few jejune discourses which the weakest "capacity pick out of books be a sufficient qualification for a "minister? Shall it also suffice to say his conversation is "not scandalous? This is but a negative and may recom- "mend to the Communion of the Church, but not to the "order of priesthood....What crying scandals do go upon "the ministers in the West. I am loathe to believe the halfe

"of what is said; but if they be innocent more might be "done for their justification."

He next draws the attention of the bishops to the preaching of the clergy, of which he has no high opinion.

"It cannot be denyed that many of the presbyterians "did far outdo us. What are preachings turned to? long "formal discourses often impertinent and unintelligible to "the vulgar.... How dry are our long preachments where the "poor people must be worried an hour at least with such "mean stuff. It is your part to see to the correcting of this "by acquainting yourself with the way of the ministers, not "only in these studied composures, which they may have "upon occasions, but with their ordinary way of preaching, "that you may be able to advise and direct them."

He goes on to suggest to the bishops the following reforms, the setting up of an order of deacons in the Church; the introduction of a catechism "plainer and "more practicable than the Westminster Shorter Cate-"chism and not so scholastic"; the celebration of the Communion at least four times a year in each congregation (once a year he says is the general practice); and especially the improvement of the Church Service. "Our Church "prayers," he says, "are long, without any order, and often "very dull. This Church is the only one in the world that "hath no rule for worship. Even the Presbyterians had their "directory.... The compiling of a grave lyturgie, the prayers "whereof shall be short and Scriptural and fitly depending "on one another, should be no inconsiderable service to the "Church. Were such a composure proposed without any "ceremonies (which are of no necessity and give great "occasion of stumbling), and without imposing it upon any "one person, it should certainly at long runne turn to our "great advantage.... It were good the form of our praises "were amended, these slow long tunes whereby but a few "lines at a time are sung are not the best way. And why "we have no gospel hymns as well as the gloria patri I see "no reason."

He next pleads for a stricter discipline to cope with "the "deluge of wickedness that hath almost quite overflowen the "land. The want of discipline is no small defect, for except "some ragged relics of Presbytery we have none. The sins

"of those that are in a higher rank are connived at. It is "great injustice and argues a baseness and timidity of spirit "to enjoin penance to the meaner, and let the great ones go "free. Drunkenness, customary swearing, and scandals of "uncleanness are notour of many persons who are daylie in "your eye. Is the apostles' rule observed (that with one who "is called a Brother, if he be such, we ought not to eat), "when persons are your confidents with whom christian "Bishops ought not to familiarly converse?"

Burnet lastly assures the bishops that in sending them this memorial he is doing them a friendly office ("telling "them plainly what others are saying in corners"), and concludes thus: "By reforming your own order, us and "the people, you shall acquit yourselves faithful of the duty "of Bishops...heal the wounds of this diseased Church...be "highly favoured of God, and to crown all your reward shall "be full, you shall be ever with the Lord."

This extraordinary document, which for plain speaking could not be surpassed, was signed by Gilbert Burnet. It is greatly marred by a colossal self-conceit. When we remember that its author was only twenty-three years of age, the presumptuous and impertinent manner in which he addresses his ecclesiastical superiors is quite indefensible. Yet apart from this it is on the whole a true indictment of the bishops who, by their negligence and mismanagement, were ruining their Church. The sting of the memorial was its truth. Cockburn asserts that the bishops "were at first "inclined to let the matter drop" (certainly their most prudent course), but they learned that Burnet, contrary to his promise in the memorial, had given copies of it to his "presbyterian friends." Burnet on the other hand declares that the matter only became known through the proceedings of the bishops. This result only is certain. He was summoned to answer for his conduct. At the first meeting Cockburn declares he answered "with his usual natural "boldness," and another day was appointed for his appearance and for receiving his sentence. Archbishop Sharp advocated deposition and left the meeting in a passion, when the majority, led by Scougal, declared for a severe censure. On Burnet being called (Cockburn says) Bishop Scougal laid plainly before the offender "his pride, vanity

"and insolency, his false and indiscreet zeal, his busy "meddling without his sphere and without a call, his pre- "varication and rashness to widen the differences of the "Church...but considering and hoping that he had a deep "sense of his miscarriage, it was agreed upon his humble "submission and acknowledgment to let him go with a "rebuke. I dare not say that knees were expressly "mentioned to me, but I always understood it that he was "required to confess his faults and ask pardon on his knees."

The latter statement is improbable. Burnet made no abject submission, as the following letter he wrote to the Bishop of Edinburgh clearly shews.

SALTOUN, 5*th March*, 1666.

MY LORD,

That any action of mine should occasion the least displeasure or trouble to my superiors cannot but much vex myself. The judging a reformation to be necessary is a thought I cannot avoid. All ranks, both of the clergy and laity, have sinned, and all ought to be reformed, and till this be carried out no external amendments will recover us.—My Lord, my desire of this engaged me to represent to yourself, with others of my Lords the Bishops, my thoughts in order to it wherein (altho' I conceive I grounded them upon authority not to be contemned) I assumed not in the least to dictate, only to propose my own opinion with the grounds inducing me to it. This I intended neither for any public discoursing nor private reproaching either of your orders or persons, to both of which I shall pay all due esteem, but for a plain representation to yourselves which, having done without counsell or advyce of any, 'tis the lesse wonder if I have erred and been mistaken in many things.

I am sorry that it hath given so great offence: I am sure I intended none by it. As for the form of my whole paper, or the particular expressions of it, or the manner of addressing it, I shall not stand to justify them, but wherein I have transgressed do beg pardon. I shall only desire that, be it never so irregularly done, the matter be impartially weighed, that so good a cause suffer not by my meddling

in it, but that a reformation of all abuses that be among us be vigorously promoted; that, the Church and Churchmen being purified, the work of religion be zealously advanced. And how difficult soever this may appear at a distance, I am assured that when gone about it shall be found both easy and of unspeakable satisfaction to those who apply themselves to it, and by the blessing of God, which is never wanting to such endeavours, shall greatly redound to the infinite advantage of this so desolate and broken Church. I shall never cease to pray for it, and shall labour patiently and wait for His coming Who will make all things new. Meanwhile I shall endeavour to carry myself so that neither by the letting this abroad nor any other way ought may come from me which is contrary to the duty of

My Lord,

Your most humble and most obedient son and servant,

GILBERT BURNET.

This dignified letter shews us that Burnet could get out of a difficult situation remarkably well. Of course his memorial could not be kept secret: too many had seen it. But publicity did him no harm. He had voiced the sentiments of the nation, and Scotsmen must have enjoyed the spectacle of a young man bearding the dreaded bishops.

He describes with great moderation the various opinions regarding his memorial:

"What I had ventured on was variously censured, but "the greater part approved of it. Lauderdale and all his "friends were delighted with it, and he gave the king an "account of it, who was not ill pleased at it."

This is very probable. Charles II had a keen sense of humour.

What Burnet felt most acutely in the Episcopal censure was the accusation that his action was due to vain-glory.

"I resolved," he says, "to let the world see that I had "done nothing in design to make myself popular. I retired "from company, I stayed constantly at home, I entered into "an ascetic course for two years." We shall see with what result.

Meanwhile public events quickly vindicated the wisdom

of his criticism of the bishops. Sir James Turner was again sent to the southern and western counties to coerce the stubborn Presbyterians. Maddened by his oppressive exactions the peasantry rose in rebellion. Ill disciplined and badly armed, they marched towards Edinburgh and were completely defeated at Rullion Green.

"The best of the Episcopal clergy (Burnet tells us) "set upon the bishops to lay hold on this opportunity for "regaining the affections of the country by becoming "intercessors for the prisoners....Many of the bishops went "into this, and particularly Wishart of Edinburgh....But "Sharp could not be mollified."

The prisoners were treated with merciless cruelty, torture being freely used, till the indignation of the country grew so strong that the king felt some change must be made in the government.

Probably Burnet took no part in this attempt to influence the bishops. His memorial was too recent a thing for him to be a *persona grata* in that quarter. His position too must have been singularly complicated by the action of his mother, who, true to her presbyterian sympathies, was hiding one of the fugitive ministers in her house in Edinburgh.

He was, at this time, trying to forget the world. In his quiet parish he was living the life of an ascetic and studying hard all the works of the Mystics on which he could lay his hands. Cockburn's remarks on this attempt are amusing, though not without a touch of malice. "He— "[Burnet]—shewed all the airs of zeal and piety and made "as if he would imitate the austerities of the ancient monks "and hermits...and live up to the strict rules which "St Chrysostom, St Gregory and St Ambrose prescribe "to the clergy. But the constitution of his body could "not bear austerities or severe penances, nor could his "pragmatical genius endure retirement."

With his usual zeal and earnestness, however, Burnet gave his new method a fair trial. He persevered in it for two years, till, as he says:

"The whole mass of my blood was corrupted so that "two great fevers in two subsequent years convinced me "that I ought not to continue longer in that manner of ill

"food." The second attack was exceptionally severe. It continued thirty days, and he tells us, "For some hours "I seemed to be in the last agony and for some minutes lay "as dead."

To this period of his illness we may refer the following anecdote. Burnet's mother was summoned to his sick-bed. During the delirium of the fever, the patient, imagining that he was to entertain Archbishop Sharp, cried—"Where shall "we find a place for the Archbishop"? The old lady, forgetful of her son's condition, replied—"Do not let that "disturb you my dear: we will find a place for him in the "hottest corner of hell."

Burnet had too much sense not to perceive at last the unhealthiness of the life he was living. He thus describes the effect it had on his spiritual condition:—"I learned indeed "to neglect my body and live upon little. I grew to despise "the world and had so little need of wealth that I contemned "it. I loved solitude and silence, and so I avoided many "tentations, but I was out of measure conceited of myself, "vain and desirous of fame beyond expression. I grew into "a superstitious overvaluing of the severities I underwent, "and became very scrupulous in all the circumstances relating "to them. The worst of all was I undervalued all who did "not practise the same things. I never felt any internal "apprehensions of extraordinary impulses, though I cannot "deny that I desired mightily to feel them if such things "were to be felt, and I was sometimes very near a resolution "of abandoning the world, and of going into some remote "place in a disguised habit where none knew me, that so I "might instruct poor people as being one of themselves."

From such morbid fancies Burnet was roused by the great change that had taken place in the government of Scotland. The indignant representations that had been made to the king by Tweeddale, Kincardine and Sir Robert Moray concerning the misgovernment and the cruel treatment of Scotland had at last produced the desired effect. In April 1667 the Earl of Kincardine came north and informed Burnet that "Lord Rothes was to be stripped "of all his places, and to be only Lord Chancellor. The "Earl of Tweeddale and Sir Robert Moray were to have "the secret in their hands...the army would be disbanded,

"and things would be managed with more temper both in "Church and State. This was then so great a secret that "neither the Lord Rothes nor the two Archbishops had "the least hint of it."

The welcome change, hastened by the successes of the Dutch fleet, took place in June. Tweeddale and Moray, men of sense and exemplary conduct, held the reins of government, and a better day seemed to be dawning for the distressed country.

"There was a great application to business" (Burnet tells us). "No vice was held in reputation, justice was "impartially administered, and a commission was sent to "the western counties to examine into all the complaints of "the unjust and illegal oppressions."

An attempt was now made to bring peace to the distracted Church. The project was not an easy one. The two-fold difficulty faced the authorities, what to do with the Presbyterian ministers who had been ejected, and how to deal with those who had taken their place. The latter problem was quite as difficult as the former, for the men who had succeeded to the livings were as unsatisfactory a class of ministers as any Protestant Church ever had.

Sir Robert Moray, after his tour in the west, expressed the opinion "that, they were such a set of men, so ignorant "and so scandalous, that it was not possible to support them "unless the greatest part of them could be turned out and "better men put in their places. But it was not easy to "know how this could be done. Archbishop Burnet had "placed them all, and he thought himself in some sort bound "to protect them. The clergy were so linked together that "none of them could be got to concur in getting proofs of "crimes brought against their brethren and the people of the "country...said to accuse a minister before a bishop...was a "homologating his power. So Moray proposed that a court "should be constituted by a special commission from the "king, made up of some laity as well as the clergy, to try "the truth of these scandalous reports."

The difficulties in the way of this drastic Erastian measure were so great that the proposal came to nought. The diocese of Glasgow remained the weak spot in the Episcopal Church. On the withdrawal of the soldiers the

churches became empty, and the people began to ill-treat the ministers in the hope of frightening them away.

With regard to the ousted Presbyterian ministers, Tweeddale's scheme was to place the ablest and most law-abiding of them in vacant parishes. Certain conditions were laid upon them, but they were not required to acknowledge the bishops' authority nor to attend the synods and presbyteries. This scheme, known by the name of "the Indulgence," was not put in force till 1669. It was kept back because of the attempt of a half-crazy Presbyterian fanatic to assassinate Archbishop Sharp in July, 1668. The Government also hesitated between the rival schemes of Indulgence and Comprehension, the latter being strongly advocated by Leighton and Kincardine. It is not surprising that Burnet, though only twenty-five years of age, should have been asked to assist in this policy of toleration. Most of the members of the government were his personal friends; he was the confidant of Bishop Leighton, who was to be the chief ecclesiastic in Scotland for the next five years; and his former denunciation of the bishops had not yet been forgotten. Through his family connection with the leading Presbyterians, he was able to give the government valuable assistance in the necessary negotiations.

During a visit to Edinburgh he had been introduced by Sir Robert Moray to the Duchess of Hamilton. Her intimate friend was Lady Margaret Kennedy, Burnet's future wife. Both ladies were zealous Presbyterians.

"She was," says Burnet, "a woman of great under-"standing, eminently devout and charitable, and indeed a "pattern of virtue. She would never dispute in matters of "speculation, but went on this ground, that the Presbyterians "were better men, better preachers, and more successful in "their labours than the Episcopal clergy."

Burnet gladly accepted her invitation to Hamilton Palace, a visit which proved of great consequence to his career in more ways than one. While there he became acquainted with the Rector of the University of Glasgow. Burnet had already written an interesting little treatise entitled "Thoughts on Education." It is addressed to a nobleman, probably Lord Kincardine. Tinged here and

there with the utopianism natural at twenty-five, the book is also distinguished by robust good sense. With its classical and modern "sides," it might well interest educationists of the present day. He dissents emphatically from the severity usually practised at the time. "Nature," he says, "made children, children and not "men." His method of teaching Latin is admirably practical. Greek, for an ordinary country gentleman, he scarcely recommends, though he considers it an advantage to read the Testament in its original tongue, and from that point of view even Hebrew may be studied. French, Spanish and Italian can be easily acquired through Latin, but German he thinks unnecessary, as all Germans write in Latin. History, with an apparatus of well illuminated maps, botany, natural history, chemistry, some mathematics and astronomy, and the art of fortification, should form part of the curriculum, while the theory of music and the study of architecture and statuary should not be ignored. The history of the Philosophic sects should be taught, and the training may wind up with a little rhetoric and logic, all the difference between these being that "one is reason in a "court dress, the other in a military garb." A good English style, both in writing and reading, must not be neglected. Field sports should be encouraged. Gardening, music, painting, mechanics and chemical experiment afford agreeable pastimes to those interested in each pursuit.

Such views were probably drawn from his own experience when he was taught by his father, and when he himself superintended the education of Andrew Fletcher the Patriot. Always a brilliant conversationalist and never inclined to hide his light under a bushel, Burnet probably gave full expression to his views on education in his intercourse with the Rector of Glasgow University, not without effect as will afterwards be seen. Meanwhile political work was not neglected.

"I stayed at Hamilton," he says, "for some days and "I had a very particular information of the state of the "country brought me by many hands of different sorts." "Things were there in a very lamentable condition. The "clergy were a sad pack of people, and were so much hated "that upon the slackening of the rigorous execution of the

"laws they were universally deserted. Scandalous reports "passed upon most of them, and they were generally "believed. The people were running either into gross "ignorance or into wild fanaticism. Some of the most "extravagant of their teachers drew multitudes after them "and filled their heads with many strange conceits, while "the more sober of that persuasion were cautious and "looked on without interposing. So it was proposed that "those who were most moderate of the Presbyterians "might be put into some of the vacant churches to keep "the people in some order."

With his usual impulsiveness Burnet wrote to Lord Tweeddale describing what he had seen and heard, and advocating this proposal. He calls it an "indiscreet letter," meaning that it was written on his own initiative. But this plea for reform had a better reception than his memorial to the bishops. It arrived when Tweeddale was advocating the Indulgence, and was so favourably considered that it was read to the king. Such a letter Burnet says, "would have signified nothing "had Tweeddale not been fixed in the same notion, but it "gave the deciding stroke." If it earned the approval of the court he has to tell of another result. "It drew the "hatred of the Episcopal party on me to such a degree that "I could never overcome it."

It was probably immediately after his return from Hamilton, and just before the proclamation of "the Indul-"gence," that Burnet wrote the book entitled "A Modest "and Free Conference between a Conformist and a Non-"conformist about the present distempers of Scotland, in "six dialogues, by a lover of peace." It was published anonymously and "by order," 1669. In the stationer's preface reference is made to one "upon whose motion the "sheets came to be published contrary to the author's design "and without his order." The person referred to was probably a member of the Government, and a personal friend of Burnet's. A letter also tells us that the form of the book had been suggested by an English work of the same title, and that it had been written "in as few hours as the sheets could be transcribed." No doubt Burnet was trying to put in print his Hamilton experience. It is a clever, but not a

convincing book. The dialogue form is handled with considerable skill, the scriptural phraseology of the Covenanter being imitated with some dramatic ability. The Conformist states in an able and fairly impartial manner the position of the moderate Episcopalian, but, as might be expected, the arguments of the Nonconformist are weak and do not well represent his side of the controversy. Burnet's censures on the conduct of the Presbyterians, both before and after the Restoration, are very like those of his *History*. His Erastian views and his statement of the doctrine of passive obedience, though more amply developed in a later tract, are clearly outlined.

The book attracted much attention, and drew forth bitter replies in which somewhat reckless charges of heresy were hurled against the author. In a second edition Burnet added a seventh dialogue praising the Indulgence and maintaining his orthodoxy. It is needless to say that the book did not convince the Presbyterians. As a witty poet sang, they were men

> "Whose stubborn hearts could not be turned
> "By dialogues of Gibby Burnet."

On June 7th, 1669, the Indulgence received the royal sanction. The Privy Council was ordered "to appoint so "many of the outed ministers as have lived peaceably and "orderly in the places where they have resided to exercise "the functions of their ministry in vacant parishes—"... subject to the approval of the king's ministers. To those ministers for whom vacant parishes could not be found, a yearly pension of £20 (four hundred merks) was to be given. The latter provision was never put in force, for none of the Presbyterians would accept it. "They looked on it as the "king's hire to be silent, and not to do their duty."

The first provision was received with more favour as the promise of better things. Forty-two ministers were appointed within the year to vacant parishes, among whom were the learned George Hutcheson and the well-known Robert Douglas who was placed in Pencaitland, a parish adjacent to Saltoun. The ministers thanked the king for this favour, promising "that they should at all times give such obedience "to laws and orders as could stand with a good conscience."

But the Indulgence was not generously administered.

Only a small minority of the Presbyterian ministers received the benefit of it, and their position was made irksome by ever-increasing restrictions. They were censured if people from other parishes resorted to their preaching, or if they admitted such to Communion or baptized their children. They were forbidden to lecture in their own pulpit, or to preach out of their own parishes. They were prohibited even from going out of the parish, unless with the express permission of the Council. The people who at first had hailed the Indulgence with gladness gradually grew disgusted with such bald Erastianism. They soon perceived the danger that threatened the very existence of Presbyterianism. The ministers who submitted to the restrictions of the council were nicknamed "the king's "curates," and became quite as unpopular as the Episcopal clergy. Tweeddale had succeeded in one of his objects—he had divided the Presbyterians. He had also destroyed the confidence of the people in some of their leaders, but he had made the solution of the ecclesiastical problem a much more difficult task than it had formerly been.

But the first opposition to this famous Act of Council came from another quarter. Burnet, Archbishop of Glasgow, regarded the Indulgence with dismay. The many vacancies which had been made in his large diocese by the rash act of his predecessor had never been fully supplied, and he had no wish to see those vacant parishes filled by Presbyterian ministers. Accordingly in September, 1669, when the Synod of Glasgow met, a "Remonstrance" was drawn up on the Archbishop's proposal, "protesting "against the Privy Council's unlawful act."

When they heard of this, the king and his councillors were first amazed, then furious. Protests from Presbyterians were common, and in a way expected, but a protest coming from an Archbishop who had sat in the Council was beyond endurance. The king bursts into unkingly language when he thinks of it. "This "damned paper," he writes, "shews the Bishops and "Episcopal people are as bad on this head as the most "ardent Presbyterians and Remonstrators." Lauderdale describes it as "the insolent, impertinent Glasgow paper. "That country (he continues) is unlucky. It seems they will

"be Remonstrators by what name or title soever they are "distinguished."

Moray—Stoic though he was—cursed it quite as freely, and "thought the Archbishop and his whole synod, at least "all that command in it, ought to be deposed or banished "if not worse."

Parliament met on October 19th, and Lauderdale resolved to place the Royal Supremacy in the Church beyond dispute. There could be no more striking proof of his ability than the manner in which he carried the Assertory Act which invested the king with supreme authority over "all persons and in all causes ecclesiastical." The Scottish Parliament was at this time incredibly servile, but to obtain the almost unanimous assent of all classes to an Act which everyone regarded with suspicion was a triumph of Parliamentary strategy. He appealed to the prejudices of the Presbyterians and persuaded them to vote for the measure in order that the bishops' power might be curbed. How the nobility were influenced is well told in Sir George Mackenzie's oft-quoted words.

"Most of the Lords of the articles inclined to the "motion, because by this all the government of the Church "would fall in the hands of the laws and especially of "councillors of which number they were: and the nobility "had been in this, and the former age, kept so far under "the subjection of insolent churchmen that they were more "willing to be subject to their prince, than to any such "low and mean persons as the clergy, which consisted now "of the sons of their own servants or farmers."

But Lauderdale's greatest triumph was the securing of the assent of the bishops themselves; for all the bishops present voted for it, even Leighton.

"He was," says Burnet, "against any such act, and got "some words altered in it. He thought it might be stretched "to ill ends and was very averse to it, yet he gave his vote for "it, not having sufficiently considered the extent of the words "and the consequences that might follow such an act; for "which he was very sorry as long as he lived....He thought "he was sure the words 'ecclesiastical matters' were put in "after the draught and form of the act were agreed upon."

So passed this notorious Act, which few wanted, and many disliked.

Nor did the government's success end here, on the same day (November 16) the Militia Act was passed, giving the king authority to march 22,000 men wherever he pleased in his dominions. The change wrought by the two acts is well stated in Lauderdale's words "The "King is now Master here over all causes and persons."

An outburst of popular indignation followed this Parliamentary betrayal of the nation's liberties. Burnet evidently impressed by the agitation somewhat unnecessarily disclaims all responsibility for the Assertory Act:

"I had no share in the councils about this Act. I only "thought it was designed by Lord Tweeddale to justify the "Indulgence, which he protested to me was his chief end "in it."

There was certainly another object. The Government wished to punish the Archbishop of Glasgow for his daring Remonstrance. He was forced to resign. But he returned to the same office five years after a much more submissive man.

In the last month of the same year Gilbert Burnet was translated from Saltoun to Glasgow. The Rector of the University there had not forgotten his brilliant young friend whom he had met at Hamilton, and proposed him as Professor of Divinity. So Burnet left the quiet East Lothian parish where he had laboured so faithfully and so acceptably for nearly five years.

"I confess," he writes, "the lamentations of the good "people of Saltoun made my parting with them very hard "to me. It is not easy for me to express the violence of the "passion they expressed, nor the many tears they shed on "that occasion."

And the affection was not on one side only. It was an admirable trait in the character of this warm-hearted man that he never forgot his early friends. Forty years after, when he was a bishop of the Church of England, he remembered the little country parish in Scotland where he had spent five useful years, and left by his will "twenty "thousand merks (about £1100) as an expression of my

"kind gratitude to that parish which had the first-fruits of "my labour, and among whose people I had all possible "kindness and encouragement."

Many memorials of Gilbert Burnet in Saltoun have disappeared. The Manse where he lived no longer stands. The Bishop's Tree, which tradition asserts he planted with his own hands, fell a few years ago. "The Bishop's Loft" (gallery in church) was swept away in the church renovation. But the Communion cups which he presented are still used for their sacred purpose, and the minister's library, the schoolmaster's salary, the poor of the parish, and the children of the public school, are still benefited by the Bequest which bears the name and is due to the liberality of Saltoun's ablest and most distinguished parish minister.

CHAPTER IV.

PROFESSOR IN GLASGOW. THE ACCOMMODATION AND THE INDULGENCE. BURNET AT COURT. BREACH WITH LAUDERDALE.

Glasgow, where Gilbert Burnet was to find his home for the next four and a half years, was then the second largest city in Scotland. It is described by the English visitors of the period—never lavish with their praise of anything Scots—as "a city fair, large and well-built cross-"wise, somewhat like unto Oxford, the streets very broad "and pleasant, containing a population of about twenty "thousand persons, and having a situation which, for "pleasantness of sight, sweetness of air and delightfulness "of its gardens and orchards, enriched with most delicious "fruits, surpasseth all other places in this tract."

The citizens were proud of their University and of their beautiful cathedral. The fact that their city was the seat of an archbishop called forth a less unanimous feeling.

"Glasgow," says an English traveller, "is as factious as "it is rich. The most considerable persons of quality "are well disposed to the Church. But the disaffected "make up that defect with number, and sometimes call "the hill-men or field-conventiclers to assist them."

The wholesale ejection of the ministers in 1662 was nowhere more keenly resented than in Glasgow. Nowhere was ecclesiastical warfare more fiercely waged.

Coming from the east of Scotland, where Episcopacy seemed to have triumphed, Gilbert Burnet found himself among men who would submit to it on no terms. He had debated the great question of the day in his "Modest "and Free Conference," and had confuted the Nonconformists to his own satisfaction—on paper. The same

problem now faced him in a form much less easy to deal with. He was only twenty-six years of age, and his career had hitherto been one of remarkable and uninterrupted success. His character was now to be tried by difficulty and failure.

Of life in the University of Glasgow an interesting account is given by a young English Nonconformist, who was a student when Burnet was professor. "The good "orders of the College were very agreeable to mine inclina- "tion. At five o'clock in the morning the bell rings and "every scholar is to answer to his name. The day is spent "in private studies and public exercises in the classes; at "nine at night every chamber is visited by the respective "regents. The Lord's Day is strictly observed, all the "scholars called to the several classes, where, after religious "exercises, all attend the Primar and Regents to church, "forenoon and afternoon.... Then in the evening called again "to classes, and then come under examination concerning the "sermons heard, and give an account of what was appointed "the foregoing Sabbath in some theological treatises, viz., "Wollebius or Ursin's Catechism, etc., and other religious "exercises, and then to supper and chambers so that there is "no room for vain ramblings and wicked prophanation of the "day if we were so disposed, and such restraints are great "blessings to licentious youths.—The public worship in the "churches, though the Archbishop himself preach, is in all "respects after the same manner managed as in the Presby- "terian churches in England, so that I much wondered why "there should be any dissenters till I came to be informed of "the renunciation of the covenant enjoined and the imposition "of the hierarchy, etc. There is also a comely face of religion "appearing throughout the whole city in the private exercises "thereof in the families, as may appear to any that walks "through the streets, none being allowed, either in or out of "church time, to play or saunter about, but reading Scriptures, "singing psalms, etc., to be heard in most houses."

Burnet was admitted Professor of Theology on December 2nd, 1669, and began the work with characteristic energy. Of his method of teaching he has left us the following account. "My chief business was to form the students of "Divinity right, and I laid down a plan for it which made

"all my friends uneasy, because they thought it was not "possible for me to hold out long in it. Yet I let no part "of it fall all the time I stayed there....Every one approved "of the scheme, only they thought it ought to be the work "of two or three men....

"On Monday I made all the students in course explain "a part of the body of Divinity in Latin with a thesis, and "answer all the arguments. On Tuesday I had a prelection "in Latin, in which I designed to go through a body of "Divinity in ten or twelve years....On Wednesday I went "through a critical commentary on St Matthew's gospel "which I delivered in English....On Thursday I expounded "a Psalm in Hebrew, comparing it with the 70, the vulgar, "and our version. And by turns on next Thursday I "explained the Constitution and the ritual, and made the "Apostolical canons my text, bringing every particular I "opened to them to one of the canons. On Friday I made "the students in course preach a short sermon upon a text "that I gave them and...shewed them what was defective or "amiss in the sermon, and how the text ought to have been "opened and applied. Besides all this, I called them all "together in the evening every day to prayers. I read a "parcel of Scripture, and after I had explained it I made a "short sermon for a quarter of an hour upon it. I then asked "them what difficulties they met with in their studies and "answered such questions as they put to me. Thus I applied "myself for eight months in the year to answer the ends of "a professor with the diligence of a schoolmaster. This "obliged me to much hard study. I rose early and studied "close from four to ten, six hours, but was forced to throw "up the rest of the day."

His great learning, his tireless industry, his religious enthusiasm, and, it may be added, his complacent self-confidence made Burnet an admirable teacher. Perhaps we see him at his best in this capacity. Work was his delight. He filled the hours, which his duties as a professor left him, by taking an active interest in the political and literary matters of the day. But he never neglected his first duty. Whether as parish minister or professor, or later as bishop, the punctual and faithful discharge of the duties of his office was an admirable mark

of his character. We have evidence that his teaching was jealously watched. In the divided state of ecclesiastical feeling in Glasgow we are not surprised that there were two different opinions as to the influence he exerted over the students.

Kirkton, the most spiteful of Presbyterian annalists, thus describes it.

"Burnet was placed in Glasgow colledge, to breed our "young divines; and what a fry his disciples were, the Lord "knows better than the godly people of Scotland who refused "to hear them or own them. Some of them declared "themselves Papists, as Mr Alexander Irvine and Mr John "Row. But their most common politick profession was "latitude and indifferency in opinions and questions, and this "truely, not because they thought so, but because hereby they "were in best case to turn and serve the times without "reproach of inconstancy, and they knew little what the "public profession of the land might turn to be. And lastly, "if you would know what integrity of spirit was among "them, consider their last work, the sting in their tail "'The Presbyterian Eloquence.' The authors are said "to be Mr Gilbert Crocket and Mr John Monroe."

Kirkton who is himself severely handled in the scurrilous book referred to is mistaken as to its authorship[1]. Perhaps the mistake may explain his savage attack on Burnet's teaching. For in fairness he should have given the professor credit for "breeding" another pupil[2] who led the Covenanters at the battle of Drumclog. Indeed we may take it as evidence of Burnet's moderation that both extreme Presbyterians and extreme Episcopalians never hesitated to bring against him the most absurd accusations. The latter constantly accused him of being a Presbyterian in disguise, while Kirkton lays to his charge the somewhat inconsistent heresies of Socinianism and Popery. That the Protestantism of the Glasgow professor was beyond suspicion, is shewn by the following incident. It was discovered that the Countess of Traquair was educating her son as a Roman Catholic. "The Council, "therefore, ordained that she should send him to Glasgow to "Mr Gilbert Burnet, to be educat and bred at the colledge

[1] The authorship of the book is generally ascribed to "Curate Calder."
[2] Sir Robert Hamilton.

"of Glasgow in the company of the said Mr Gilbert, at the "sight and by the advice of the Archbishop." The Council evidently considered this the best cure for Popery.

But another charge brought against him is of more interest in the light of his later theological standpoint. The Church of Scotland, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, was strongly Calvinistic in doctrine. Certain expressions in his "Modest and Free Conference" laid Burnet under the suspicion of Arminianism. In meeting this charge, he says truly enough that his words do not contradict the Calvinistic doctrine, but with some prudence he declines to discuss the question at greater length. The probability is that he was beginning to feel his way towards his later doctrinal position.

This tendency is noticed in the contemporary criticism of his preaching, for though Burnet had begun to shew already exceptional powers in the pulpit, the suspicion of his orthodoxy and the antipathy which the people felt towards Episcopal ministers told against his popularity. Even in his mother maternal affection could not overcome Presbyterian prejudice. She did not approve of his pulpit ministrations, and is reported to have declared with her usual plainness of speech that her son "would be a bee-headed "fool all his life-time...that one day he would be preaching "up the Presbyterian interest, and the next day he would "preach the contrary and throw down that which he had "formerly built up." As sarcastic are the references of Cunningham—a bitter enemy of Burnet. He describes him as "preaching much, and in pompous strains, con- "cerning the contagion of original sin, and the strict "preservation of virginity and widow-hood[1]...blending the "opposite doctrines of Arminius and Calvin with great "eloquence and applause to the no small admiration of "the vulgar."

Burnet's sermons must have been delivered with unusual vigour. McWard sneers at "his scenical gesticu- "lations" and "affected grimaces." Another contemporary refers to the same habits in the following lines :

> "Like some school-boys their lessons saying,
> Who rock like fiddlers a-playing,
> Like Gilbert Burnet when he preaches."

[1] Burnet when Cunningham wrote had been three times married.

Burnet knew evidently that his "gestures" were often criticised. "I took," he confesses, "a tincture of their "(*i.e.* the French) way more than Scotland could well "bear."

Another of Kirkton's charges is to the effect that "Burnet "was a man more disdained in the west countrie than "followed in London, for though he speaks the newest "English diction, he spoke never the language of ane "exercised conscience." The sneer is very amusing; at a time when most Scotch ministers preached in the vernacular, to speak "the newest English diction" was to be marked as a clerical fop. But even from such hostile criticism we may infer that Burnet was beginning to develope those gifts which afterwards made him the popular London preacher.

If there be any doubt about Burnet's popularity as a preacher in Glasgow there is none as to his influential position in ecclesiastical affairs. Three weeks after his arrival the enforced resignation of Archbishop Burnet took effect. It was the intention of the government to nominate as his successor Bishop Leighton; but he declined the office so firmly that it was found necessary to send him to London, in the hope that the king might overcome his reluctance. Burnet informs us, that Leighton, on his way south sent for him "to know what prospect there was of "doing any good. I could not much encourage him, yet "I gave him all the hopes I could raise myself to, and I was "then inclined to think that the accommodation was not "impracticable."

During Leighton's absence, Burnet was much consulted by the government. He first devoted himself, to hearing the complaints of the Episcopal clergy. "They were very "ill used," he says, "and were so entirely forsaken by their "people, that in most places they shut up their churches. "They were also threatened and affronted on all occasions. "On the other hand, the gentlemen of the country came as "much to me, and told me such strange things, of the vices "of some, the follies of others, and the indiscretions of all, "that though it was not reasonable to believe all they said, "yet it was impossible not to believe a great deal of it....It "was not easy to know what ought to be believed...for I

"found lying and calumny was so equally practised on both "sides, that I came to mistrust everything I heard. One "thing was visible, that conventicles abounded and strange "doctrines were vented in them. The king's supremacy "was the chief subject of declamation. It was said that "the bishops were indeed enemies to the liberties of the "Church, but the king's little finger would be heavier than "their loins had been. After I had been some months "among them and had heard so much that I believed very "little, I wrote to Lord Tweeddale, that disorders did certainly "increase, but as for any particulars, I did not know what "to believe, much less could I offer to suggest what "remedies seemed proper. I therefore proposed that a "Committee of Council, should be sent round the country "to examine matters."

The proposal was adopted, and the Committee, some of whose members were personal friends of Burnet's, came to the West in April, 1670. It was empowered to punish those who had committed assaults on the Episcopal clergy and those who attended conventicles. It was further to inquire into the conduct of the indulged ministers, and specially to inquire if they had obeyed the Act of Council forbidding them to lecture before sermons. The proceedings of the Committee, according to the accounts of both sides, were marked by no undue severity.

Burnet thus describes their action and the censure it brought upon himself: "they punished some disorders and "threatened some of the indulged ministers with greater "severities if they should grow still more insolent in the "favour that had been shewn them. I was blamed by "the Presbyterians for all they" (*i.e.* the Council) "did, "and by the Episcopal party for all they did not, since "these thought they did too little, as the others thought "they did too much. They" (the Commissioners) "con-"sulted much with me, and suffered me to intercede so "effectually for all they had put in prison, that they "were all set at liberty. The Episcopal party thought that "I intended to make myself popular at their cost, so they "began that strain of fury and calumny that has pursued me "ever since from that sort of people as a secret enemy to "their interest and an underminer of it."

Meanwhile the political situation in England had become extremely complicated. Charles II, having got rid of Clarendon, was virtually his own Prime Minister, for the five members of "the Cabal" were simply his creatures—a cabinet with no common policy and no head save the king. The policy of Charles was to keep down opposition at home with the help of French troops and French gold, in return for which England was to declare war on the Dutch and make peace with the Roman See. James Duke of York, the king's brother, was almost openly a Romanist. Two of the ministers, Arlington and Clifford, were secretly of the same faith. With these Charles concerted the measures that finally took shape in the secret Treaty of Dover. With regard to this transaction, Lauderdale, with the other Protestant members of the Cabal—Buckingham and Ashley—was kept completely in the dark. His standard of political morality had not grown loftier with time. His character had deteriorated, and under the influence of the brilliant and unscrupulous Countess of Dysart, was fast developing its darkest features. His natural tendency was to sink the statesman in the courtier and to fall in with whatever policy the king approved. In all probability he had agreed to the Dutch war and the employment of Scotch troops to overawe the English opposition. He had no objection to absolutism. But Lauderdale had not sunk so low as to become accomplice in the disgraceful royal intrigue to make England Roman Catholic.

Leighton, on his arrival in London, observed the change for the worse in Lauderdale, whose temper, never very amiable, had become extremely violent. Tweeddale, however, smoothed over things as much as possible. The only condition on which Leighton would undertake the administration of the diocese of Glasgow was that he should be allowed to take measures to include the Presbyterians in the Established Church. A scheme of comprehension was not regarded with favour at the court, as the king had abandoned the same policy in England for that of toleration. But as Leighton's help was indispensable, the royal sanction was at last given. Burnet had his doubts as to the good faith of the king in the matter, and these were confirmed by after events. "Lord Lauderdale," he says, "was authorized

"to pass the concessions that were to be offered into laws. "This he would never own to me though Leighton shewed "me the copy of them. But it appeared probable by his "conduct afterwards that he had secret directions to spoil "the matter, and that he intended to deceive us all."

Leighton still retained the title of Bishop of Dunblane, declining to become Archbishop, though he undertook the administration of the See of Glasgow *in commendam.* Burnet, therefore, to his great delight, was now under the spiritual jurisdiction of the man he most revered, and was ready to give all the help that loyal friendship and willing service could bring to the furtherance of the new scheme.

The chief motive which induced Leighton to accept his new office was his desire to bring peace to the distracted Church. But it may be doubted whether he had realised the difficulty of the task he had undertaken. Even at the Restoration the formulating of a likely scheme to include Presbyterians and Episcopalians in one Church would not have been easy. The events of the last ten years had almost made it an impossibility. The Presbyterians may be called Nonconformists, but not in the modern sense of the term. None of them thought of disestablishment, even the most fanatical of them strongly asserted the principle that there ought to be a union between Church and State. What seemed intolerable to them was that the Church should be the servant of the secular power, that the government should alter the orders, discipline or creed of the Church without its full consent. This principle had been violated in 1661 by the restoration of Episcopacy, when the orders and discipline had been changed by the secular power without even a pretence of consulting the Church. The passing of the Assertory Act, for which Leighton had voted, had made matters worse, for it gave the king absolute ecclesiastical authority. To enter a church on such conditions meant for the Presbyterians the abandonment of all the principles for which their fathers had fought since the Reformation. Leighton, on the other hand, was a thorough-going Erastian. To him forms and church government were of little importance. He had signed the covenants, accepted office under Cromwell, and a bishopric

from Charles II. To induce the Covenanters to accept his views was a hard if not an impossible task.

Leighton's life of quiet retirement had further unfitted him for taking part in public affairs. He had little knowledge of men or of business, and the ideals of a recluse, however attractive on paper, rarely stand the rough test of practical life. His saintly character won the esteem of all who knew him. But he was not a leader of men, nor was he able to communicate to others the enthusiasm of his own ideals. He wanted moreover the persevering ardour which endures failure. His earnest attempt to bring peace to the Church must command admiration. But he shewed a strange and culpable subservience to Lauderdale. He and his fellow-workers—Burnet included—deserve to be blamed for failing to realise that Lauderdale was using them as his tools in carrying out his scheme to establish the arbitrary power of Charles II.

After his arrival in Glasgow, Leighton lost no time in promoting his scheme of comprehension or the Accommodation, as it was usually called. In this he had the hearty and able assistance of Burnet. They first proceeded to visit some of the leading Presbyterian ministers to inform them that such a plan was projected, and to secure their favourable consideration of it. The reception of the two ambassadors of compromise was far from encouraging. Burnet thus describes it: "Leighton told them that some of them "would be quickly sent for to Edinburgh, where terms "would be offered them to making up our differences.... "They received this with so much indifference, or rather "neglect, that it would have cooled any zeal that was less "warm and less active than that good man's was. They "were scarce civil, and did not so much as thank him "for his tenderness and care....Leighton began to lose "heart, yet he resolved to set the negotiation on foot and "carry it as far as he could."

Before the meeting took place in Edinburgh Lauderdale had added to the difficulties of the situation. During the months of June and July, the Presbyterians asserted in a most emphatic manner their right of meeting for worship. Three great field-conventicles were held "in places where "none had been held before." For the first time many had

attended armed, and in one instance had successfully resisted a king's officer who had come to disperse them. "That," says Burnet, "gave a handle to call them the ren-"dezvous of rebellion. Some were taken and brought to "Edinburgh, and pressed to name as many as they knew of "their fellow conventiclers; but they refused." Lauderdale dealt with the matter in his usual headstrong fashion, without in the least considering Leighton's negotiations. On August 3rd he induced Parliament to pass an "Act anent Deponing" which punished with fine, imprisonment, or banishment all who refused to give evidence.

On August 9th, six of the leading Presbyterian ministers were summoned to Holyrood House to meet several of the Members of Council along with Leighton and Burnet. Archbishop Sharp declined to attend, but sent Bishop Paterson to watch the proceedings. The Conference was opened by Lauderdale with a speech in which he enlarged upon the king's great condescension and his wishes for a complete unity and harmony. "Leighton followed," so Wodrow informs us, "insisting much upon his Majesty's "clemency and benignity, mixing in some bitter remarks "upon some alleged evils in the Presbyterian constitution "he had observed when among them."

If there was really any want of tact in Leighton's speech, the concessions he offered were most generous. The Accommodation may be stated in Burnet's words, though perhaps full details were not made known till the meeting at Paisley.

"Leighton proposed that the Church should be governed "by the bishops and their clergy mixing together in the "Church judicatories, in which the bishop should act only "as president, and be determined by the majority of his "presbyters, both in matters of jurisdiction and ordination; "and that the Presbyterians should be allowed, when they sat "down first in these judicatories, to declare that their sitting "under a bishop was submitted to by them only for peace "sake, with a reservation of their opinion with relation to "any such presidency; and that no negative voice should be "claimed by the bishop...that such as were to be ordained "should have leave to declare their opinion if they thought "the bishop was only the head of the presbyters. He also

"proposed that there should be provincial synods to sit in "course every third year or oftener if the king should sum- "mon them, in which complaints of the bishops should be "received, and they should be censured accordingly. The "laws that settled episcopacy and the authority of a national "synod were to be altered according to this scheme."

Leighton closed his speech with an earnest and moving appeal to all to work together for the peace of the Church. On the following day Hutcheson replying for the Presbyterians, declared that "their opinion for a parity among the "clergy was well known; the presidency now spoken of had "made way to a lordly dominion in the Church; and, "therefore, how inconsiderable soever the thing might "seem to be, yet the effects of it both had been and would "be still considerable; he therefore desired some time "might be given them to consider well of the propositions "now made, and to consult with their brethren about them; "and since this might seem an assembling together against "law, he desired he might have the king's commissioners "leave for it."

Lauderdale was not at all pleased with the cautious reply of the Presbyterians.

"He made us all dine together," says Burnet, "and came "to us after dinner; but could scarce restrain himself from "flying out, for their behaviour seemed both rude and crafty. "But Leighton had prepared him for it, and pressed him not "to give them a handle to excuse their flying off by any "roughness in his deportment towards them." The result was that the Presbyterians received permission to consult with their brother ministers about the Accommodation, and promised to give their answer on the first of November.

If Leighton was able to restrain Lauderdale's speech at Holyrood, he had no control over his actions. The Conference had little chance of success in any case, but Lauderdale doomed it to out and out failure. Three days after he passed what he himself describes as "a clanking "act," in which all field-conventicles were declared treasonable, preaching at them was made a capital offence, and owners of land on which such meetings should be held were made liable to a heavy fine.

Leighton was greatly distressed at the passing of this

act, of which he knew nothing till it was too late. He expostulated with Tweeddale declaring, according to Burnet that "it was so contrary to the common rules of humanity, "not to say Christianity, that he was ashamed to mix in "councils with those who could frame and pass such acts, "and he thought it somewhat strange that neither he nor "I had been advised with in it. The Earl of Tweeddale "said the late field conventicles being a new thing, it had "forced them to severities that at another time could not "be well excused; and he assured us there was no design "to put it into execution."

We cannot wonder at Leighton's indignation, but the case seemed to demand something stronger than a mere protest to Tweeddale.

It was in such inauspicious circumstances that the terms of the Accommodation were made public. They were received by the Episcopalians with a storm of criticism. Sharp declared "that Episcopacy would be undermined if "the negative voice of the bishops was given up," an opinion shared by most of the bishops and the clergy. The originators of the scheme believed that the greater part of the nation approved of their design, and accordingly they resolved to make an appeal to the people.

Wodrow thus describes the step they took: "The "Council are prevailed with to hire and send west some "of the Episcopal clergy, whose fame, learning and preach-"ing gifts might most recommend them to the people. "They were by the country people termed 'the Bishop's "'Evangelists.' These persons, at least some of them, were of "such reputation with their admirers, that it was reckoned "all the west would be proselyted by them, or at least "very much exposed if they fell not in with them."

Burnet's influence in this mission is distinctly proved by the fact that five of the six men were, or had been, members of the Presbytery of Haddington; while the sixth, Mr James Aird, was his personal friend. Of Burnet, Wodrow, who wrote after the Revolution, speaks in the most flattering terms as a man "well known to the world "since, first Professor of Divinity in Glasgow, and after "that persecuted for his appearing against Popery and for "the cause of liberty, and since the Revolution, the learned

"and moderate Bishop of Sarum, one of the great eye-"sores of the high-flyers and Tories in England, and a "very great ornament to his native country."

Kirkton is not so complimentary in his description of the men and their work. "The men," he says, "were "Mr James Nairne, their paragon, a man of gifts, but "much suspected as unsound; Mr Gilbert Burnet, a man "more disdained in the west country than followed at "London, for tho' he speaks the newest English diction, "he spoke never the language of ane exercised conscience. "Another was Mr Lawrence Charters, a silent, grave "man, but most unfit to make country proselytes, because "of his very cold utterance, men wondered he should "have undertaken it. Then Mr James Aird[1], commonly "called 'Mr Leighton's ape,' because he could imitate his "shrug and grimace, but never more of him. Mr Patrick "Cook[2], so ordinary a man, I have nothing to say of him, "and Mr Walter Paterson[3], a man so obscure, I never "heard of him."

Kirkton is equally sarcastic regarding the results of their mission.

"The harvest they reapt was scorn and contempt. A "congregation they could never gather; they never pre-"tended to have made a proselyte. In some places some "few went to hear them for once, and that was all. In "some places they barracado'd the doors; in some places "stole the rope; in some places the tongue from the bell. "So they quickly wearied of this foolish employment."

If the preachers were made the victims of such boyish pranks, it must be allowed that Burnet's account is fair and even generous.

"The people of the country came generally to hear us, "but not in any great crowds. We were, indeed, amazed "to see so poor a communality so capable to argue upon "points of government, and on the bounds to be set to the "power of princes in matters of religion. Upon all these "topics they had texts of Scripture at hand, and were "ready with their answers to anything that was said to "them. This measure of knowledge was spread amongst

[1] Minister of Torryburn. [2] Minister of Prestonpans.
[3] Minister of Bolton.

"even the meanest of them, their cottagers, and their "servants. They were, indeed, vain of their knowledge, "much conceited of themselves, and were full of an en- "tangled scrupulosity, so that they found or made difficulties "in everything that could be laid before them. We stayed "about three months in the country, and at that time there "was a stand in the frequency of conventicles. But as "soon as we were gone a set of these hot preachers went "round all the places in which we had been to defeat all the "good we could hope to do. They told them the devil "was never so formidable as when he came transformed "into an angel of light....The people had now got it that "all that was now driven at was only to extinguish Presby- "tery by seeming concessions with the present generation, "and that the ministers, if they went into it, they gave up "their cause, that so they themselves might be provided "for during their lives, and die at more ease." A report was also spread that the king "was weary of supporting "Episcopacy in Scotland, and was resolved not to clog his "government any longer with it, and that the concessions "now made did not arise from any tenderness we had for "them, but from an artifice to preserve Episcopacy....And "because a passage of Scripture was apt to work much in "them, that of *touch not, taste not, handle not*, was often "repeated among them."

The appeal to the people had failed. The only hope which remained—a very faint one—was that the answer of the ministers might be favourable. The answer, owing to the absence of Tweeddale, could not be given in November, so Leighton, taking advantage of the delay, made another attempt at reconciliation. Five Episcopalians and twenty-six Presbyterian ministers met together in conference at Paisley, on December 14th. Again Leighton earnestly exhorted them to make every sacrifice that conscience allowed them, for the peace of the Church. But the differences could not be settled. The Presbyterians demanded "that the King's Supremacy in ecclesiastical matters should "only be a 'potestas civilis,'" to which Erastians, like Leighton and Burnet, could not agree. A heated debate also took place about the priority in time of the offices of bishop and presbyter. Leighton assigned to Burnet the

defence of the Episcopal position, and the professor, strong in his knowledge of Church History, eagerly joined in the fray. It is interesting to note that the Presbyterians were the High Churchmen, taking their stand on the Divine Right of Presbytery, while the Episcopalians took the Broad Church view, which may be stated in Burnet's own words: "that forms of Church Government were in "their own nature indifferent, and might be good or bad, "according to the hands into which they fell." Of course, it was also maintained that Episcopacy had the strongest historical position, and was most suitable to the times. It is needless to say that both parties claimed the victory in the argument. After two days the Conference broke up, no basis of agreement having been found.

The final scene in the history of the Accommodation took place at the beginning of the year 1671. A meeting was held in Edinburgh on January 11th, when the six Presbyterian ministers met the Duke of Hamilton and the Earls of Rothes, Tweeddale, and Kincardine, along with Leighton and Burnet.

Hutcheson, in the name of his brethren, firmly refused the compromise. Between the 11th and the 21st frequent conferences were held. But nothing could shake the resolution of the Presbyterians. As a last resource Leighton "offered a public conference in the hearing of all that had "a mind to be rightly informed." Hutcheson declined it as useless and "not safe." "Mr Burnet," Wodrow says, "insulted a little because the Presbyterians would not "appear in their cause, which they called the Kingdom of "Christ. Upon this Mr Wedderburn accepted the challenge, "provided that the Chancellor and Councillors present "would allow him....But the allowance was not granted, "and so the proposed accommodation broke up."

On the 21st of January, 1671, Kincardine wrote to Lauderdale announcing the failure of the Accommodation, and giving a doleful account of the condition of the Church. "To-day we had our valedictory meeting with the Bishop "of Dunblaine and those ministers employed by the rest "of the indulged ministers. They declined to give their "answer in writing as they had promised, but submitted to "have it taken down, which shews a petty peevish humour.

"After this the Bishop had a most excellent discourse which "he pronounced in so good tearmes that the answeres "which some of them thought themselves to make to it "grated on my ears....He is truly an excellent person, and "out-did himself to-day....Upon the whole matter I know "not what to say, it is so hard a chapter. That west "countrie is in great disorder, the churches of orderly "ministers almost totally deserted, conventicles beginning "to peepe out again, the churches of indulged ministers "flocked to in an extraordinary manner, about forty "vacancies in that diocese, and very few fit to fill them, "and nobody willing. And 'tis no wonder that men of "any parts should be unwilling to go to live in a place "where they must be in continuall quarrellings and con-"tempt, and where they are sure to be hated and contemned "of their parish, though they should live and preach like "St Paul. And which is likewise very sad, the orderly "ministers amongst them are such pitiful persons, that they "can do nothing for the churches or their own reputation. "The Bishop says they are neither good enough to keep in, "nor bad enough to turne out. What to do for the cure "of this is hard to advise. We are to fall upon it next "weeke, and 'tis like the indulged ministers will be con-"fined by the councill to their parishes, and some strict "injunction put to them."

Leighton and Burnet were greatly distressed at the failure of their scheme. They knew they had deeply offended one party without conciliating the other. Burnet speaks bitterly about the unreasonable conduct of the Presbyterians.

"Our part in the whole negotiation," he says, "was "sincere and open. We were acted with no other principle "and no other design but to allay a violent agitation of "men's spirits...and to heal a breach that was like to let "in an inundation of miseries."

He forgets his own admission that Leighton had another motive, for in another passage he says: "He "proposed such a scheme...reckoning that if the schism "could be once healed, and order be once restored, it "might be easy to bring things into such a management "that the concessions then to be offered should do no great

"hurt in the present, and should die with that generation.... "Therefore he went indeed very far to the extenuating "episcopal authority, but he thought it would be easy "afterwards to recover what seemed necessary to be yielded "at present."

But others had perceived this scheme, and "in vain "was the net spread in the sight of the bird." As is clearly shewn by their refusal of the Accommodation the Presbyterians had come to the decision that ecclesiastical orders and discipline were not to be settled by the secular power without the full consent of the Church. The persecution which they endured in consequence alienated the sympathies of the people from the royal house. It gradually destroyed the popular belief in the Divine Right of Kings. It also had its effect on the Revolution of 1690, whose triumph would not have been so easy, nor so bloodless, had Scotland not been made wiser through suffering.

Meanwhile, Burnet saw the hopelessness of any further attempt to carry out the Accommodation. "The roughness "of our own side," he says, "and the perverseness of the "Presbyterians, did so much alienate me from both that "I resolved to withdraw myself from any further meddling, "and to give myself wholly to study."

It was not in his nature, however, to be idle, and he soon found new and important work. "I made," he says, "many visits to Hamilton, which lay within eight miles of "Glasgow, and growing into a high measure of favour with "the Duke and Duchess, and having a great esteem of "them, I took pleasure to be for some days there, where "I was very easy and free."

It was during one of these pleasant visits that he first began to think of writing the *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton*.

"I saw by all the common books," he tells us, "that "her (*i.e.* the Duchess') Father had been hated by both "parties, so this inclined me to think he was a moderate "man, who has commonly that fate. This gave me first "the curiosity to examine into all his actions....I offered "my services to the Duchess to examine the papers she "had with relation to her father and her uncle's ministry. "She had kept them carefully, but had not then found a

"person to trust them to. She had such an entire con-
"fidence in me that she put them all in my hands, and
"I read them with great care."

Possibly Burnet had heard from the Duchess of the Earl of Clarendon's application to see some of the Hamilton Papers, and this led him to examine them for himself. It is affirmed by Cockburn that the work was entrusted to Burnet only because he promised to vindicate the character of James Duke of Hamilton from the severe reflections made by Guthry, Bishop of Dunkeld, and also from the mistakes made by Sir James Turner in his *Memoirs*. This statement is clearly wrong. Turner's notes bear witness that he did not see Guthry's manuscript till after the author's death in 1676 and after the publication of Burnet's book in 1677. We have therefore no reason to doubt Burnet's statement that the idea of writing the *Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton* originated with himself.

Burnet set to work on the Hamilton Papers with such energy that he had completed the narrative in a few months. But this was by no means the final form of the book. It was much altered before permission to publish it was asked in 1673. What Burnet had intended at first to be merely the *Memoirs* of two noblemen, received a second and more ambitious title—*The History of the Church and State of Scotland, Pt. II.*, and was evidently meant to be a continuation of Spottiswoode's *History*[1]. It gives an account of Scottish affairs from 1638 to 1651, a period which it is still difficult to discuss with impartiality. In Burnet's time the difficulty was immeasurably greater. The veneration for the Martyr King was so profound that even to criticise his actions fairly was dangerous. Besides, many who had taken a prominent part in the events described were alive, and had notoriously changed sides. To look for an unbiassed history in the state of feeling which then prevailed is to expect an impossibility.

What Burnet has given us in the *Memoirs*, completed in 1673 and published in 1677, is a most readable account of an

[1] It is actually described in some of the copies of the first edition as the second volume of Spottiswoode's *Hist. of the Church of Scotland.*

exciting period, marked by great industry, and valuable in many respects. Though it is highly coloured with loyalist feeling, yet it compares most favourably with other historical works of the same time.

A grave charge against the author is made by Hickes, a most malignant critic, to the effect that Burnet, after his quarrel with Lauderdale, deliberately altered and suppressed passages of the original manuscript, because they gave credit to that nobleman. Hickes was either mistaken or wilfully misrepresented facts. An examination of the manuscript shews that the passages omitted referred to Lauderdale's father. The Duke with whom Burnet quarrelled receives a higher character in the *Memoirs* than many will think he deserves.

Burnet himself, however, at a later day makes the following confession about his book: "I did indeed conceal "several things that related to the king. I left out some "passages that were in his letters. In some of them "was too much weakness, in others too much craft and "anger. And this I owe to truth to say that, by many "indications that lay before me in those letters, I could "not admire either the judgment, or the understanding, or "the temper of that prince. He had little regard to law, "and seemed to think that he was not bound to observe "promises or concessions that were extorted from him by "the necessity of his affairs."

These assertions may be justified from the letters, but it must be confessed that they stand in glaring contrast to the exalted character of Charles I given in the Hamilton *Memoirs* and other of Burnet's works. Possibly they represent the facts in the light of his later opinions. The profound veneration for the memory of the ill-fated monarch is almost incomprehensible to us now. To conceal facts little creditable to Charles I might appear to a youthful royalist, even when writing history, an act of loyalty, though twenty years after it might not seem so justifiable. The reading of those letters first raised doubts in Burnet's mind as to the blamelessness of the Royal Martyr. He probably put them aside as the rankest heresy. But the doubts had arisen, and these, being developed by increased knowledge and experience, changed

the ardent royalist into the critic of later years. Such a change of opinion may be due to a love of truth and not to the want of it.

When news of this work reached Lauderdale, he invited Burnet to come to London and submit the book to him, "as he was sure he could give it a finishing." At what time of the year Burnet went is not quite clear. He certainly was in London in the month of August, 1671. Of Lauderdale's proffered help, he says: "All the addition "he gave to my work was with relation to the passages in "which he had a share."

Sir Robert Moray gave more important assistance, and suggested that, instead of writing the *Memoirs* in narrative form, Burnet should embody the authoritative documents at length. The work having been re-written on this plan received from Sir Robert the very extravagant compliment "that he did not think there was a truer history writ since "the Apostles' time."

Burnet at this time stood high in Lauderdale's favour. "I found," he says, "another degree of kindness and con-"fidence from him upon my coming up than ever before. "I had nothing to ask for myself but to be excused from "two bishoprics, but whatsoever I asked for any other "person was granted, and I was considered his favourite. "He trusted me with all secrets, and seemed to have no "reserves."

The position of favourite was not without its difficulties. A serious quarrel had taken place between Lauderdale and Moray, due to the brilliant Lady Dysart, under whose influence Lauderdale had completely fallen. Burnet was now asked to break off his friendship with Moray, but he sturdily refused. "I told Lord Lauderdale," he says, "that Sir Robert Moray had been a second father to me, "and therefore I could not break friendship with him, but "I promised to speak to him of nothing he trusted to me, "and this was all he could ever bring me to, though he "put it often to me."

Even when Moray, conjecturing that such a request had been made, urged his young friend to accede to it for his own advantage, Burnet resolutely declined. Moray's magnanimity went even farther. The Countess of Lauder-

dale, disgusted at her husband's intimacy with Lady Dysart, had left him and retired to the Continent. This had become the subject of much public comment, so that Burnet had grave doubts as to the propriety of paying his respects to Lady Dysart. "Sir Robert," he tells us, "put "an end to that, for he assured me that there was nothing "in that commerce which was between them besides a vast "fondness."

Burnet, not yet convinced, questioned Lauderdale. "I "asked him how he had parted with his wife. He gave "me a better account of it than I expected. I knew she "was an imperious and ill-tempered woman. He said she "herself desired it, and she owned that she was not at all "jealous of his familiarities with Lady Dysart, but that she "could not endure it because she hated her. I was then "persuaded to go to her, [*i.e.* Lady Dysart], and was treated "by them both with an entire confidence."

The evidence of Lauderdale's innocence is not very convincing, nor can the witness be described as impartial. Burnet must have been very willing to be persuaded. The friendship of a powerful nobleman sometimes outweighs many scruples.

Of Lady Dysart he has left us a vivid picture. "She was a woman of great beauty, but of far greater "parts. She had a wonderful quickness of apprehension, "and an amazing vivacity of conversation. She had studied "not only divinity and history, but mathematics and philo-"sophy. She was violent in everything she set about, a "violent friend, but a much more violent enemy. She had "a restless ambition, lived at a vast expense, and was "ravenously covetous, and would have stuck at nothing by "which she might compass her ends. She had blemishes "of another kind which she seemed to despise, and to take "little care of the decencies of her sex."

This character sketch belongs to a much later day. On his first introduction to Lady Dysart, who received him most graciously, Burnet was as much charmed with her as she was with him. She had already brought about a quarrel between Lauderdale and the Earls of Argyll and Tweeddale. Burnet having, as he says, the sanction of Lauderdale, endeavoured to play the part of peacemaker.

The attempt failed, but in the case of the Duke of Hamilton, with whom also there had been a quarrel, he succeeded better. "I got" he says "kind letters to pass on both "sides, and put their reconciliation in so fair a way, that "upon my return to Scotland it was for that time fully "made up."

The Church question was still the great difficulty in Scotland. The Accommodation had been definitely given up, but the troubles which it had sought to cure still existed. Leighton had consented to accept the office of Archbishop of Glasgow, though he had not yet been translated. On October 9th, 1671, he wrote to Burnet complaining that nothing had been done about the vacant parish kirks, and saying, "I am not doubtful of yo[r] utmost assistance both "where you are and when you return."

Lauderdale had asked Burnet's advice about the same matter. "I gave it frankly," the latter informs us, "to "this purpose. There were many vacancies in the "disaffected countries to which no conformable men of "any worth could be prevailed on to go. I proposed "that the indulgence should be extended to them all, "and that the ministers should be put into these parishes "by couples, and have the benefice divided between "them; and in the churches where the indulgence had "already taken place, that a second minister should be "added, and have the half of the benefice. By this means "I reckoned that all the outed ministers would be again em-"ployed and kept from going round the uninfected parts of "the kingdom. I said if this was done, either the parishes, "by gratuities, would mend their benefices, so that the two "who had only the legal provision of one, might subsist; "and if they did this, as I had reason to doubt of it, it "would be a settled tax on them of which they would soon "grow weary; but if they did it not it would create quarrels, "and at least a coldness among them. I also proposed "that they should be confined to their parishes, not to stir "out of them without leave of the bishop of the diocese or "a privy councillor, and that upon their transgressing the "rules...a proportion of their benefice should be forfeited "and applied to some pious use. Lord Lauderdale heard "me to an end, and then, without arguing one word upon

"any one branch of this scheme, he desired me to put it "in writing, which I did. And the next year, when he "came down again to Scotland, he made me write out my "paper, and turned it into the style of Instructions."

Burnet's scheme was well calculated to produce dispeace among those who were so unwise as to accept its terms. Collegiate charges have not been a great success in Scotland, but to put two ministers in a parish where there was only a stipend sufficient for one, would have caused dissension among the most peaceable of mortals. The scheme was not put in force, however, till the following year, and ere that time events had occurred which rendered insistence on its most important clause inadvisable.

Unfortunately for Burnet's reputation this was not the only paper he left behind him. In the early part of this year his opinion had been asked on a very delicate subject, and the answer he gave cannot be counted to his credit. The king had been married for nine years, and the want of legitimate offspring had been a cause of national anxiety, especially as James Duke of York, the heir to the Crown, was an avowed Roman Catholic. The question of divorce had been discussed, while some had even talked of polygamy. On these matters Lauderdale and Moray had consulted their learned young friend, and Burnet, vain of his knowledge of Civil Law and eager to display it, had given Lauderdale his written opinion. The paper was entitled: *Resolution of two important cases of conscience, viz.*, (1) *Is a woman's barrenness a just ground for divorce?* and (2) *Is polygamy in any case lawful under the gospel?* Both questions were answered in the affirmative. Burnet was afterwards heartily ashamed of this foolish paper, as is clearly shewn by the disingenuous account of the transaction which he gives in his *History*, and the following defence written twenty-five years after.

"I remember well," he says, "the Duke (then Earl) of "Lauderdale moved it to me. He was the first that ever "discovered to me the secret of King James' religion, and "when he saw me struck with great apprehensions upon it "he fell upon the Head of Divorce and told me many par-"ticulars that I think fit to suppress[1]. I afterwards knew that

[1] There is no doubt that Lauderdale deliberately misled Burnet.

"the matter of fact was falsely stated to me. I was then "but seven and twenty, and was pretty full of the Civil "Law, which had been my first study. So I told him "several things out of the digests, codes and novels upon "that head, and in a great variety of discourse we went "through many parts of it. He seemed surprised at many "things I told him, and desired me to state the matter on "paper. I very frankly did it, yet I told him I spoke of "the sudden, but when I went home among my books I "would consider it more severely. The following winter I "writ to him and retracted that whole paper. I answered "the most material things in it, and I put a confutation of "my first and looser thoughts in a book that winter which "I can shew to any that desires it."

This may be quite true, but it is no excuse. The only thing that can be said for him is that Lauderdale was a very strong character, whose influence did harm to everyone who associated with him. Burnet was no exception. His character deteriorates while he was in favour with Lauderdale. He paid dearly for this error. After their quarrel Lauderdale used it against him, and there were always ill-wishers in plenty who never allowed the Bishop of Salisbury to forget this glaring indiscretion of his youthful days.

Burnet returned to Scotland in October, and at once proceeded to Hamilton. Kincardine complains of this to Lauderdale in the following letter. "I have not seen "him since he left you, nor am I like to see him in haste. "I cannot imagine the reason of it, for he stayed a fort-"night with Duke Hamilton, and rambled through the "whole country with him. So it was not want of leisure, "and I should have thought upon occasion of the letters "past betwixt us whilst he was with you, that I should "have seen him as soon as he arrived if he had no "quarrel at me. But I suppose rather it is his humour "which cannot hold long at one point."

Perhaps Lady Margaret Kennedy could have explained how Burnet was inclined to linger at Hamilton and neglect Kincardine.

Shortly after his return, Burnet had again the opportunity of promotion. "Four bishops," he tells us, "died

"this year, of which Edinburgh was one. I was desired to "make my own choice, but I refused them all. Yet I "obtained a letter to be writ by the King's order to Lord "Rothes, that he should call the two archbishops and four "of the officers of state and send up their opinion to the "king of the persons fit to be promoted, and a private "letter was writ to the Lords to join with Leighton in "recommending the persons he should name."

It would appear from an interesting letter of Kincardine's that the names of eight men were mentioned for the vacancies. Among them were Nairn, Charteris, and Burnet, but all three declined the honour. Yet the offer must have been very tempting to Burnet. His loyalty to Leighton, which was always above suspicion, was a strong reason for acceptance. Besides, at this very time, he was trying to persuade Lady Margaret Kennedy to be his wife, and Presbyterian though she was, the lady would probably not have regarded his suit with less favour had he been made a bishop. But Burnet was not greedy of preferment. He believed that he was too young for a bishopric, an opinion which shewed his good sense, and so with a disinterestedness that is rare, he wisely declined the honour.

The condition of the Scottish Church may have helped him to this decision. Since the failure of the Accommodation matters had been allowed to drift. The draconian laws directed against the Covenanters were still in existence, but were not enforced with any severity. Even Wodrow allows that "this year does not afford such matter for a "history of the sufferings as many in the period." The Presbyterian ministers took full advantage of this leniency and held many conventicles. Some daring spirits even occupied the pulpits of the vacant parishes. Kincardine, writing to Lauderdale on the 8th February, 1672 says: "Gilbert here on college affairs, and confirms the report "we have heard of the frequency of conventicles in the "west as well as in the toune."

It was in truth no part of the policy of the Court at this time to treat the Covenanters with severity, but rather to grant to Dissenters in England and Presbyterians in Scotland, a toleration they had not hitherto enjoyed. For in accordance with the secret Treaty of Dover, war with

the Dutch had been resolved on by Charles and his Cabal. It was therefore important that the Dissenters should be kept in good humour. In order to obtain money for the war, the king in January, 1672, stopped the payments of the Exchequer for a year, of which step Burnet received a long account from Lady Dysart. On March 13th, the disgraceful attack on the Dutch Smyrna fleet took place; on the 15th the penal ecclesiastical laws of England were suspended by the king; and on the 17th of the same month war was declared against Holland.

Lady Lauderdale died at the beginning of the year 1672, and six weeks after, on February 17th, her widower married the Countess of Dysart. It was a union fraught with many an evil for Scotland. Shortly after the marriage Lauderdale was created a Duke, and at the end of May came with his lady to Scotland in great pomp. "He "was much lifted up," says Burnet, "with the French "success, and...treated all people with such scorn that "few were able to bear it. He adjourned the Parliament "for a fortnight, that he might carry his lady round the "country, and was everywhere waited on and entertained "with as much respect and at as great a charge as if the "king had been there in person. The Duchess carried all "things with a haughtiness that could not have easily been "borne from a queen."

These proceedings so disgusted the nobility, and the Dutch War was so unpopular with all classes, that Lauderdale, for the first time in his career as a statesman, found himself threatened with a constitutional opposition in Parliament. But it came to nothing, for the Duke of Hamilton, the natural leader of the opposition, was prevailed upon by Burnet to agree to the proposed war-tax, and the movement collapsed for the session. "This," says Burnet, "was imputed to the offices done by me, for they" (*i.e.* Lauderdale and Hamilton) "were often upon the point "of breaking out, and I was thought the instrument of "setting them right, for which I was bitterly censured "by those who intended to have made a rupture between "them, for nothing could have been then done in opposi-"tion to Lauderdale unlesse Hamilton would have headed "the party against him. I was blamed as an aspiring man."

There is no doubt of Burnet's loyalty to his patron. He served him on this occasion better than he served his country. Writing long after the bitter quarrel had taken place between them, he would never have claimed credit for helping the man whom he had learned to hate so heartily except it had been true. But we must be careful to observe that his later opinion often colours the narratives relating to this and the following year. He gives an accurate account of events, and describes the characters of the Duke and Duchess of Lauderdale with great justice, as they appeared to him in later days, but he does not confess, with his usual frankness, that he had once held a very different opinion. He stood high in the favour of both at this time, and he only speaks the truth when he says, "there was scarce a person so well used by Lauderdale "as myself." But the liking was not on one side only. It is always difficult to recall with exactness our former feelings of friendship towards one who has become a bitter enemy. Still Burnet should have known that in the following account he was confusing the opinions of 1672 with those of a much later date. "I was out of measure "weary of my attendance at their Court, but was pressed "to continue it. Many found I did good offices. I got "some to be considered and advanced that had no other "way of access. But that which made it more necessary "was that I saw Sharp and his creatures were making their "court with the most abject flattery. Leighton went seldom "to them, though he was always treated by them with great "distinction. So it was necessary for me to be about and "keep them right, otherwise all our designs were lost with-"out recovery."

No doubt Burnet, with that kindness of heart which even Dean Swift could not deny, used his influence to help many a friend. No doubt he felt it his duty to check Archbishop Sharp's intrigues against Leighton's policy. But he attended Lauderdale's court, not because he was compelled by duty, but because he enjoyed the society of the Duke and Duchess and their friends, and because he admired these great personages more than he afterwards cared to own. In praise of the Duchess he even invoked the Muses, and a copy of his verses still survives.

Maidment has most maliciously remarked "that the writer "appears to have entertained not an entirely Platonic "love for the lady, but soon recovered from his infatua- "ation, and from a lover, as not unfrequently happens, her "panegyrist became an enemy." This is grossly unfair. The verses are poor stuff extravagantly expressed; but Burnet's praises are for the accomplishments of the lady rather than the charms of the woman. At no time would he have denied that the Duchess was possessed of many attractions; but he certainly never addressed her as a lover.

With all his fondness for aristocratic society, Burnet was no sycophant. He was very officious in offering advice, and his censure was often exasperatingly just. He was too good a man not to disapprove of much that he saw at Lauderdale's court. His habit of speaking his mind could not have been very palatable to that nobleman, who was rarely tolerant of either advice or reproof. Accordingly we find him in trouble more than once.

"I asserted my own liberty," he says, "and found so "often fault with their proceedings, that once or twice I "used such freedom, and it was taken so ill, that I thought "it was fit for me to retire. Yet I was sent for, and con- "tinued in such high favour, that I was again tried if "I would accept a bishopric, and was promised the first "of the two archbishoprics that should fall. But I was "still fixed in my former resolution, being then but nine- "and-twenty."

The Church problem was growing more and more complicated. The Indulgence which at first had been so popular was now regarded with growing dislike. In England the ecclesiastical penal laws had been suspended by royal edict, and thus without Parliament being consulted toleration had been extended to all religious sects. But the people were very suspicious of the king's motive in this policy. It was generally believed that Lauderdale had been commanded to grant the same toleration to Scotland. To his surprise the Presbyterians would not ask for it, though they asserted their religious liberty in many conventicles. Lauderdale, Burnet tells us, "looked on nearly two months "after he came to Scotland waiting still for an application "for liberty of conscience. But the designs of the Court

"were now clearly seen into. The presbyterians under-"stood that they were only to be made use of in order to "the introducing of popery. So they resolved to be silent "and passive. Upon this he broke into a fury and rage "against them."

About the same time the letters of Carstares (afterwards the distinguished chaplain of William III) were seized, and though nothing definite could be proved, yet suspicions were raised that he had been sent from Holland to incite the discontented people to rebellion. "Upon this," says Burnet, "a severe prosecution of conventicles was set "on foot, and a great deal of money was raised by arbitrary "fines. Lord Athol made of this, in one week £1900 "sterling. I did all I could to moderate Duke Lauderdale's "fury, but all was in vain. He broke out into the most "frantic fits of rage possible. When I was once saying to "him, 'was that a time to drive them into rebellion?' "'Yes,' said he; 'would to God they would rebel, that so "I might bring over an army of Irish papists to cut their "throats.' Such a fury as this seemed to furnish work for "a physician rather than for any other man."

These words shewed Lauderdale in a new light, and greatly alarmed Burnet. His repetition of the conversation, as we shall see, was to lead him into much trouble. Lauderdale's rage passed quickly. He summoned Burnet, and consulted him about a new measure of toleration. The result was that the Second Indulgence was sanctioned on September 3rd, 1672, and its terms were practically Burnet's London proposals.

It was at this time that Burnet completed his book entitled, *A Vindication of the Authority, Constitution, and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland*, though for some reason it was not published till the following year. He was engaged, he tells us, "to write in defence of the "Government against some seditious books that were then "published." These books were the *Jus Populi* of Sir James Stewart, Advocate, and the *True Nonconformist* of McWard, an exiled Presbyterian minister. In both works the right of subjects to resist the king when he interfered with civil or religious liberty was plainly maintained.

The *Vindication* consists of four conferences. The speakers are Eudaimon, a moderate man; Philarchaeus, an

Episcopal man; Isotimus, a Presbyterian; Basilius, an asserter of the king's authority; Criticus, one well studied in Scripture; and Polyhistor, an historian.

The first conference "examines the origin and power of "the magistracy, and whether subjects may, by arms, resist "their sovereigns on pretence of defending religion against "tyranny. And whether the King of Scotland be a "sovereign prince or limited so that he may be called to "account or coerced by force."

The conclusion of the discussion—Isotimus, of course, protesting—is that subjects have no such right. Burnet's theory differed considerably from that held most commonly in the 17th century. He did not believe that the Divine Right was inherited by birth, but that it arose from a contract between king and people, in which certain rights and authority had been conferred on the king with the people's consent. This contract could not be broken except both parties agreed. As long as the king did not exceed the authority originally assigned to him all resistance was unlawful. "The sword," he says, "is only in the magistrates' "hands, and the people have no claim to it....It is true that "in case the magistrate be furious, or desert his right, or "expose his kingdom to the fury of others, the laws and "sense of all nations agree that the states of the land are "the administrators of the power till he recover himself.... "The case varies very much when the abuse is such that it "tends to a total subversion which may be justly called "a phrenzy, since no man is capable of it till he is under "some lesion of his mind, in which case the power is to be "administered by others for the prince and his people's "safety. But this will never prove that a magistrate "governing by law, though there be great errors in his "government, may be resisted by his subjects."

These are the only instances in which Burnet considers resistance permissible. But he maintains that there is no case in which subjects are justified in resisting by arms on pretence of defending religion. Their duty is passive obedience. If the conscience is violated, if the essentials of religion are attacked, men must be prepared to suffer persecution even to death, but armed resistance is unchristian and unlawful.

In the second conference it is maintained that it is quite

within the right of the magistrate to order or change the external government of the Church, for it is only in the essentials of religion that conscience is involved. In external matters the duty of subjects is to obey the powers that be.

In the third conference the wars of the Scottish Covenants are discussed. As Burnet believed that the king's authority in Scotland was unlimited, he has no difficulty in proving that the Covenanters were entirely in the wrong.

The fourth conference examines the origin, lawfulness, and usefulness of Episcopal Government. In this we have a fine and learned statement of the moderate Episcopal view, which may be summed up in the following words.

"Since I look upon the sacramental actions as the highest "of sacred performances, I cannot but acknowledge those "who are empowered for them must be the highest office in "the Church. So I do not allege a Bishop to be a distinct "office from a presbyter, but a different degree in the same "office to whom, for order and unity's sake, the chief "inspection and care of ecclesiastical matters ought to be "referred."

Burnet retained his Erastian opinions to the end of his life. But his views on the doctrine of passive obedience were to be largely modified. At the time of which we are now writing he held this theory whole-heartedly and honestly. He clung to it for long after, as he clung to most of his early notions, with a touching fidelity, even when his common-sense and enlarged ideas were forcing him the other way. When at last, driven by the logic of facts, he was compelled to give it up, there were never wanting critics who taunted him with the discrepancy between his views in the *Vindication* and his conduct at the Revolution. Inconsistency, in this case, may be taken a sign of growth. But no such charitable estimate can be formed of the Dedication of the book, addressed to Lauderdale. It was one of the most foolish things that Burnet ever wrote. It is fair to remember that, under Lauderdale's government, between 1667–72, the Presbyterians had not been much harassed, while most earnest attempts had been made to reconcile the two

ecclesiastical parties. It is also true that in the dedications of the 17th century the author generally addressed his patron in terms of fulsome flattery. Still, when all allowance is made, it is impossible to defend such a dedication as the following.

"May it please your Grace,

"The noble character which you do now so "worthily bear, together with the more lasting and inward "characters of your princely mind, did set me beyond "doubting to whom this address was to be made. For to "whom is a Vindication of the Authority and Laws of this "Kingdom so due as to your Grace, to whom His Majesty "hath, by a Royal Delegation, committed the administra- "tion of affairs amongst us, and under whose wise and "happy conduct we have enjoyed so long a tract of un- "interrupted tranquillity. But it is not only your illustrious "quality that entitles you to this dedication. No. Great "Prince, greater in your mind than by your fortune; there "is something more inward to you than the gifts of fortune, "which, as it proves her not blind in this instance, so "commands all the respect can be payed your Grace "by such who are honoured with so much knowledge of "you as hath fallen to the happy share of your poorest "servant."

Burnet was to find, as we shall see, that this Dedication was a most awkward fact. It had been written, he always maintained, (though Lauderdale denied this) at the special request of the Duke, who asked to see the epistle dedicatory before publication. Writing in the year 1696 Burnet excuses himself thus: "It is no wonder if one, then but 28 "years old, went too high in the compliment....If what "happened a year and a half after this gave me other "thoughts of that minister of state that does not prove "that I wrote disingenuously at that time."

It was probably[1] in this year that Burnet married privately Lady Margaret Kennedy, the daughter of the

[1] The date is uncertain, Burnet states (*a*) that he was married 13 years, which, as his wife died May, 1685, would place the marriage in 1672, (*b*) that the marriage remained a secret two years. As it became public the same week as his appointment to the Rolls Chapel, 1675, this would place it in 1673 or 167$\frac{3}{4}$.

Earl of Cassilis. Burnet was of good birth and held an honourable position. He renounced all claim to his wife's private fortune by a deed signed before the marriage. The lady seems, however, to have regarded the marriage as a mésalliance, so perhaps the objections to making it public came from her. Burnet, in the following account, takes the full responsibility for the imprudent step upon himself.

"She was 18 years elder than I, and having lived till "then in a high reputation she saw a marriage on such an "inequality would much lessen her, nor did she think it "decent, in me it would have a face of ambition and "covetousness; and of all this I was so convinced that "I resolved often to break it off, but my affection was so "strong that it returned upon me allwaies and at last after "two years sute we were married, but so privately that none "but the Bishop of E[dinburgh] who wrot the license and "Mr Charteres who married us and two other witnesses "knew anything of it, and it continued a secret for two "years. This was an inexcusable piece of folly in me, for "which when it broke out we were severely censured."

Meanwhile the second Indulgence did not realise the expectations of Burnet. He lays the blame of its failure on the manner in which it was administered.

"The benefit was extended to forty more churches. "This, if followed as to that of doubling them (the Presby- "terian ministers) in a parish, and of confining them within "their parishes, would have probably laid a flame that was "spreading over the nation....But Duke Lauderdale's way "was to govern by fits, and to pass from hot to cold ones "always in extremes. So this of doubling them, which "was the chief part of our scheme, was quite neglected. "Single ministers went into these churches, and those who "were not provided for went about the country holding "conventicles very boldly without any restraint; and no "care at all was taken of the Church."

Leighton and Burnet were greatly discouraged. Every plan they had adopted for reconciling the Presbyterians had failed. The only result of their attempts had been to make themselves more unpopular with the Episcopal party. Leighton, despairing of doing any good, had begun to speak of giving up his office and going into retirement. Burnet tried hard to dissuade him, but in vain.

In the civil administration of the country also matters were going from bad to worse. Monopolies of salt, brandy, and tobacco had been granted to the supporters of the government, and Burnet tells us that "the people were "provoked at Lauderdale's insolence, his engrossing every-"thing to himself and a few friends, and his wife and "brother setting all things to sale."

He was still loyal to Lauderdale, his sanguine temperament leading him to believe that matters might be set right by a personal appeal to the Duke. The Hamilton *Memoirs* were now nearly completed. But it was necessary to go to London to obtain the royal license to publish the book. Ere he set out he received the news of Sir Robert Moray's death—July 4th, 1673—a personal loss which Burnet lamented as irreparable.

On his arrival in London, about the end of August, he found the city greatly excited by the political events of the year. Hitherto Charles II had experienced little trouble with the English Parliament. He was now to find it in an angry mood. The Dutch War was extremely unpopular, and had brought little credit to English arms. The closing of the Exchequer had exasperated the commercial class. But above all the Declaration of March 1672 had alarmed the nation. By it the King, on his own authority, had suspended the execution of the penal laws against papists and nonconformists alike. The provisions of the Treaty of Dover were unknown, but it was generally believed that the King sought to promote the interests of Roman Catholicism. In his speech at the opening of the session he had said, "I tell you plainly, gentlemen, I mean "to stick to my Declaration." Parliament, however, firmly demanded that it should be rescinded. For some time the relations of king and parliament were strained almost to the breaking. Civil war even seemed possible, and Lauderdale is said to have advised the King to summon the Scottish troops. But Charles at last gave way. The seal of the Declaration was broken, and the Test Act of March 1673 received the royal sanction. This Act disqualified from holding public office all who refused to take the Communion in the Church of England.

Burnet was received with great kindness by Lauderdale, who inquired particularly about the condition of Scotland.

"I gave him," Burnet says, "a very punctual and true "account of it. He seemed to think that I aggravated "matters, and asked me if the King should need an army from "Scotland to tame those in England, whether that might "be depended on. I told him certainly not. The com- "mons in the southern parts were all Presbyterians, and "the nobility thought they had been ill used...and only "waited for an occasion to show it. He said he was of "another mind, the hope of the spoil of England would "fetch them all in. I answered the King was ruined if ever "he trusted to that."—This interview was to have, as we shall see, an important influence on Burnet's career. He was much disturbed by this conversation. It enabled him to see more clearly than ever before the ruthless and unscrupulous character of Lauderdale. He was alarmed at the Duke's reckless suggestions, and also at his profound ignorance of the true state of feeling in Scotland. He attempted to enlighten the Duchess as to "the injustice "and oppression that Scotland was groaning under, but "I saw," he says, "she got too much by it to be in any way "concerned at it. They talked of going down to hold a "session of parliament in Scotland. I warned them of "their danger, but they despised all I could say."

He had no reason, however, to complain of the Duke's personal kindness. For the purpose of obtaining the royal license to publish the Hamilton *Memoirs* Lauderdale took him to the Court and presented him to the King, saying, "Sir, I bring one to you who is not capable of "forgetting anything." To which the King replied, "Then, "my Lord, you and I have the more reason to take heed "what we say to him or before him."

Burnet's reception was very flattering.

"The King," he tells us, "bid me bring them [*i.e.* the *Memoirs*] "to him, and said he would read them himself. "He did read some parts of them, particularly the account "I give of the ill conduct of the bishops, and told me he "was well pleased with it. He was at that time so much "offended with the English bishops for opposing the "toleration that he seemed much sharpened against them. "He gave me back my book to carry it to Secretary "Coventry to the licensing of it."

Coventry was not prepared to grant the license till he had read the whole of the book. This entailed a longer stay in London than Burnet had intended. The time, however, passed most pleasantly. He made the acquaintance of Sir Ellis Leighton, the Archbishop's brother, but very unlike him in character. By him Burnet was introduced to the Duke of Buckingham. This nobleman, a brilliant man, but notorious for his profligacy even in the Court of Charles II, had at this time "set up for a patron of liberty "of conscience and of all the sects." He was delighted with the conversation of one who had been such a consistent upholder of toleration, and gave such a favourable account of him, that Burnet was asked to preach before the King. His Majesty praised the sermon very highly. "He ordered me," says Burnet, "to be sworn a chaplain, "and admitted me to a long private audience that lasted "above an hour, in which I took all the freedom with him "that I thought became my profession...with relation to his "course of life....He bore it all very well and thanked me for "it. Some things he freely condemned, such as living with "another man's wife; other things he excused, and thought "God would not damn a man for a little irregular pleasure. "He seemed to take all I had said very kindly, and during "my stay at Court he used me in so particular a manner "that I was considered as a man growing into a high "degree of favour."

Burnet was also treated with even greater favour by James, Duke of York, to whom he gave a letter found among the Hamilton papers, addressed to the Prince by Charles I. The liking which the Duke took to the Scotch professor was extraordinary when we consider the difference in their characters and views. Their frequent interviews were largely spent in religious discussions. Perhaps James hoped to convert Burnet to Romanism. The latter certainly desired to win the Prince from his Popish errors, and obtained leave to bring Stillingfleet to convince him of the superiority of Protestantism. The attempt needless to say failed, but did not lose Burnet the Prince's friendship.

London at this time was ringing with discussions on Popery, and the royal favour did not prevent Burnet taking part. Never idle, even when on holiday, he wrote and

published during his London visit two tracts. The first was entitled, "The Mystery of Iniquity," an able and for the time a temperate criticism of the Popish system. It was thought worthy of an answer six years after[1]. The second was entitled, "Rome's Glory, or a collection of "divers miracles wrought by popish saints, collected out of "their own authors, with a Prefatory Discourse, declaring "the Impossibility and Folly of such vain Impostures."

The royal favour which Burnet enjoyed had now begun to excite the jealousy of the Duke and Duchess of Lauderdale. The latter questioned Burnet narrowly as to the subject of the conversation he had held with the King and the Royal Duke. Anxious to clear himself of all suspicion, he replied that he had talked with the Duke about religion, and with the King about the life he led. Of this imprudent answer Lauderdale was afterwards to make unscrupulous use. The displeasure of Lauderdale was increased when Burnet did not accompany him to Scotland, though the excuse offered seemed good enough—namely, that he was waiting till his book was licensed. "I said I would follow "as soon as the Secretary should despatch me, and as soon "as that was done I took post, and by a great fall of snow "I was stopped by the way. But I unhappily got to "Edinburgh the night before the Parliament met."

On his arrival on November 11th, he immediately proceeded to Holyrood, but was refused admission. Perplexed by this unusual rebuff, he went to the house of his friend the Duke of Hamilton. There he heard that Lauderdale had been speaking strangely of him as one likely to become a papist. He also learned that the servile Parliament was at last in revolt.

"Hamilton told me they were resolved next day to "attack Duke Lauderdale and his whole administration in "Parliament. I was troubled at this, and argued with him "against the fitness of it, all I could, but he was engaged. "He told me the Earls of Rothes, Argyll, and Tweeddale, "and all the cavalier party, had promised to stick by him. "I told him, what afterwards happened, that most of them "would make their own terms and leave him in the lurch, "and the load would lie on him. When I saw the thing

[1] "Anti-Haman" by W. E., 1679.

"was past remedy, I resolved to go home and follow my "studies, since I could not keep Duke Lauderdale and him "any longer in a good understanding."

Rudely though Lauderdale had treated Burnet, his anger and his suspicion had no relation to Scottish public affairs. In fact he was quite unaware that a Parliamentary revolt was impending. Next day, however, the storm burst. Member after member rose in Parliament to denounce the sins of the Government. Lauderdale was completely taken by surprise and deeply chagrined, for he had boasted to the King that he held Scotland in his power. He felt now that he was fighting for his political existence, and he fought, as he always did in a difficult situation, with masterly skill. He gave way where he saw concession was unavoidable, and abolished the monopolies. He acted on the principle *divide et impera*, and succeeded in bringing Argyll and Dalrymple to his side. In a month he had completely broken the ranks of the opposition and regained all his old ascendancy. But he was furious at this attempt to shake his authority, and his greatest wrath fell on Burnet, whom he denounced to the King as "the "chief incendiary"; the visit to the Duke of Hamilton on the night of the 11th having obviously roused in his mind the suspicion of Burnet's connection with the plot. Yet we have no ground for doubting Burnet's assertion that the visit was a coincidence, and his explanation of Lauderdale's suspicions seems quite reasonable. "He had "not looked for this [*i.e.* the parliamentary revolt], though "I had warned him of a great deal of it. But he re-"flecting on that, and the credit I had got at Court, "and on the haste I made in my journey, and my coming "critically the night before the session opened, he laid all "this together and fancied I was sent upon design as the "agent of the party, and that the licensing of my book was "only a blind. He believed that Sir Robert Moray had "laid it, and the Earl of Shaftesbury had managed it... "and he assured the King that I had been the incendiary, "and that I had my uncle's temper in me, and that I must "be subdued, otherwise I would embroil all his affairs."

Burnet felt the charge keenly, and tried to vindicate himself to Lauderdale in the following letter.

December 15*th*, 1673.

May it please your Grace,

The unusual coldness that appeared in your Looks and Words when I had the Honour to wait on your Grace last, made me not presume on a nearer Address, to ask what I now adventure, and in this way, which I hope shall offend least, which is to know what is my Crime that hath rendered me so guilty in your Esteem. To serve your Grace as it was left upon me by my old Father, so was it ever natural to me that as in the poor Sphere wherein I have moved these Ten Years since I had the Honour first to know your Grace, it hath been my constant Care, so I made Account of your Grace's Favour as my Birthright; and yet I never pretended to any other Advantage by it being rewarded by the Pleasure I find in it; but when I find I am of a sudden, and I hope without any great Guilt, fallen not only from any Room I perhaps flattered myself I had in your Grace, but am represented in the blackest Characters, that is a new though a malicious Proof of the Instability of human Things; yet though I am told I may give up your Goodness for me as irrecoverably lost, I shall with the sinking Man catch hold of every Thing that may buoy me up, and do therefore beg once to be heard before I be for ever condemned. When I went last to London it was purely the Desire of the Duke and Dutchess of Hamilton, and my own Readiness to serve them in publishing the Memoirs, that made me go; nor did I see or speak with any but them about my Journey, which I carried so secretly from all others, that only my being gone told I had set out. While I was at London I corresponded with none but Duke Hamilton, and if his and his Dutchess their vindicating me to your Grace from being an evil Instrument or corresponding to your Grace's Prejudice, do not clear me, I am sure I need not expect it, though I can give many Evidences how that ever since I had the honour to know them, I used all my poor Endeavours to preserve in them all just and deep Impressions of your Friendship for them, and to allow no Resentments. My Stay at London was occasioned by

your Grace, who found not a Conveniency for some weeks of proposing the Business, I was sent for, to his Majesty, and though that Delay was heavy for me, yet I refused to accept of the offers of some great Persons who were willing to make my Address, and was resolved rather to lose the Journey than to have that Matter proposed by any but your Grace. All the while I was at London I studied on all occasions to do your Grace Right, which made me pass under the Character of your Agent, which my Lady Myner told me a few days before I left Whitehall and my Lord Haltoun the last night I was there; this seems an Evidence that I did and spake nothing to your Grace's Disadvantage. And having very clear Expressions of your Favour when you left Whitehall, I did not doubt to find them the same at the Abbay[1], nor did I perceive any Change till being above Stairs, I was kept waiting above Three Quarters of an Hour in my Boots and no Access given though twice desired; I was also told from many Hands that both your Grace and Lady Dutchess had given very diminishing characters of me, at which I had no reason to complain, for I desired to lessen my self in my Opinion more as any other can, and so must acknowledge the Justice of undervaluing me; but finding myself out of the Posture I once stood in with you I resolved to get me quickly home and saw very few Persons. I well remember with whom I spoke. I am told my Crime is That I said to some your Grace durst not return to London. I know well from whom this comes and with whom these Discourses were, who if they had as faithfully related all as they told the worst parts of the Discourse, I needed not apprehend any Censure. Some asked me How ye stood in England. I told them As well with the King and Duke as ever, but that many in the Court and House of Commons were angry with you who designed to drive you from his Majesty, but added My Fears that the bustling at this Time in England was an Evidence they were neither fixed in their Duty to King nor Duke, so that my representing you odious to them did your Grace as great a Right as I could do. My Error in this could not amount to more than Indiscretion, and so deserves a milder Censure than Traitor and Rogue. But if your Grace and

[1] Holyrood Palace.

Lady Dutchess would remember I did to both give Hints of my Fears of Rubs ye might meet in Scotland, and told you of the Particulars, but saw myself laughed at as a Fool for my Advertisements and Advices; but sure if you both reflected on all that ever I presumed to say to you you will not find that ever I abused you in a Tittle, either by giving false Characters of Persons or Things, or by offering to put any Trick upon you. It may be my too much Freedom hath if not offended yet been less acceptable; but when you set all altogether you will, it may be, see reason to mitigate the Severity I have met with from you both against me. As I can attest God that I neither knew of any Design to oppose you in anything before I came to Scotland, so I had no Manner of Accession to it directly or indirectly, and shall never fail, be it accepted or not, to render in spite of Calumny and Jealousie all the dutiful Service in the Power of

Your Grace's most humble, most faithful,
and most obedient servant,

GILBERT BURNET.

Directed on the Back for his Grace the
Duke of Lauderdale,

his Majesty's High Commissioner for Scotland.

The promise of service made in the last sentence was never fulfilled, for Lauderdale was henceforth to show himself a vindictive enemy. A curious feature in the letter is the profound regret with which Burnet parts from his friend and patron. Nor was he singular in this respect. All Lauderdale's colleagues—Sir Robert Moray, Tweeddale, Kincardine—estimable, high-toned men who worked with him as long as they could, when obliged at length to separate, did so with deep regret and every mark of genuine affection for the man. Even the saintly Leighton, referring to his resignation, begs that there may be "no "abatement of your Grace's good opinion and favour, "though (I confess) alwaies undeserved in all other respects "unless great affection to your Grace and your service

"may pretend to some small degree of acceptance instead "of merit. And this shall remain unalterable in mee "while I live." Such expressions of affection and respect will sound strangely in the ears of those who regard Lauderdale as unutterably infamous, unless it be remembered that degeneracy is a gradual process.

Burnet remained in Glasgow during the winter months occupied with the work of his professorship, which he never neglected however busy with other matters. He knew that he was a marked man, and that his safety lay in keeping quiet. Lauderdale was now ruling Scotland in the most arbitrary way. The events of the last session had convinced him that even the abject submission of the Scotch Parliament had its limits. With his usual decision he decided to do without it. He called Parliament together on March 3rd, 1674, and at once dissolved it, never to call another during his administration. There were numerous protests, but it soon became dangerous to show disapproval of any of his acts. The advocates made an appeal to Parliament, and Lauderdale, with amazing audacity, banished nearly all the members of the Scottish Bar from Edinburgh. The Convention of Royal Burghs presented a petition praying for another Parliament, and the leading members were imprisoned. The country was seething with discontent, but the King shewed his satisfaction in his masterful minister by creating him Earl of Guildford and giving him a pension of £3000 yearly.

Ecclesiastical affairs were also in a most unsatisfactory condition. Leighton, referring to the bishops, writes on November 9th, 1673: "I believe t'were little damage to "Church and State, possibly some advantage to both, if we "should all retire." We may safely conclude that before the close of that year the two friends had realised that their efforts to induce the Scotch people to accept Episcopacy were doomed to failure. With the aid of the Duke of Hamilton they had resolved to make a direct appeal to the King. There is a long paper dated from Glasgow, May 9th, 1674, which was drawn up by Burnet and endorsed by Leighton. In it the condition of the Church is described, and the following proposals are made. "(1) That the "King should consider whether Episcopacy should be

"maintained at the rate of the trouble it has cost and "whether it should not be given up. If it is to be main- "tained, religion and order should not be neglected, and "offences against churchmen should be punished. (2) The "laws concerning the Church are too severe to be executed "and should be revised and be made practicable. (3) A "synod should be called to settle the Church."

It is difficult to say on what grounds it was hoped that such a petition would be successful, for it is a grave indictment of Lauderdale's policy. Perhaps Burnet was under the delusion that he still stood high in the favour of the King. Whatever hopes they had were frustrated by an agitation of the Episcopal clergy, peculiarly vexing to Leighton and Burnet, who knew the King's antipathy to popular clamour, and how Lauderdale would misrepresent it. It is thus described by Burnet:

"Some hot men that were not preferred as they "thought they deserved grew very mutinous, and com- "plained that things were let fall into much confusion; and "they raised a grievous outcry for the want of a national "synod to regulate our worship and government; and so "moved in the diocesan synods that a petition should be "offered to the privy council setting forth the necessity of "having a national synod. I liked no part of this. I knew "the temper of our clergy too well to depend much on "them. Therefore I went out of the way on purpose "when our synod was to meet. Petitions were offered for "a national synod which was thought an innocent thing, "yet, it being done on purpose to heighten the fermentation, "great exceptions were taken to it....I was not at all con- "cerned in this, for I was ever of Nazianzen's opinion, who "never wished to see any more synods of the clergy, yet "the King was made believe I had laid the whole matter "even though I did not appear in any part of it."

Leighton, in his correspondence with Lauderdale, speaks of the petitions of the clergy in exactly the same way. He denies that the movement began in his diocesan synod or that its origin was due to his personal friends. He allows that the genius of the Scottish Church lies much towards synods and assemblies, but like Burnet expresses his dislike of them, and emphatically disclaims connection with the

present violent agitation. It must be confessed, however, that neither Leighton in his letters nor Burnet in his *History* gives a very straightforward account of the affair. They both disliked national synods, and only thought of such an expedient in the desperate condition of the Church. It is very probable that neither of them had anything to do with the petitions from the various presbyteries and synods, and that they disapproved of such agitation as likely to spoil their petition to the King. But the fact remains that they did intend to propose to His Majesty that a national synod should be called, and Leighton had not the courage to own it to Lauderdale. The latter promptly terrorised the agitators. One bishop and four city ministers were deposed for daring to take part in such a movement. For Lauderdale[1] (as he pointed out to Leighton) had no desire that the events of 1638 should be repeated. Again he blamed Burnet as the chief incendiary though he could not prove it, and Burnet began to feel so uncomfortable that he resolved to go to London.

Another troublesome and ludicrous incident hastened his journey. On June 4th a crowd of women filled the Parliament Close in Edinburgh. They had assembled to present a petition to the Council praying (curiously enough) that the Presbyterian ministers might have such liberty as had been given them when the Duke of Lauderdale was in Scotland at the beginning of the year. The proceedings were as Wodrow confesses rather "tumultuary." The women caused Archbishop Sharp some alarm and called him Judas. Among the most prominent in the crowd were two of Burnet's cousins (daughters of Warriston), and also that staunch Presbyterian, his aged mother, Lady Crimond. The incident attracted much attention, though Burnet does not notice it in his *History*. The petition was declared criminal by the Council, and three of the ladies (Burnet's cousin among them) were imprisoned. He must have felt the whole affair exceedingly embarrassing considering his relations with Lauderdale. He felt it prudent to set out for London,

[1] One of his letters dealing with the national synod must be wrongly dated. The letter June 18th (*sic*) refers to the petition from the Presbytery of Haddington which was not signed till June 25th. *Hadd. Presb. Records.* Cp. *Laud. Pap.* II. 52–4.

ostensibly to discharge his duties as chaplain. He did not leave too soon. The following letter from Lord Halton to Lauderdale shows that his movements had been closely watched. "July 4th, 1674. Mr Gilbert Burnet took post "for London, and he will be landed before this time. "I could not know it sooner. He gives it out that his "errand is to wait as chaplain in July, being his month. "I hope you will luik to that, for he is the chief con- "trayver of this sinod and presbyterie business."

On his arrival at Court Burnet found that Lauderdale had prepared for him a royal reception very different from that of the preceding year. "Charles II" (it has been well said—and in this case he does not belie the character) "avait l'esprit propre aux grandes choses et l'inclination "portée à la bagatelle." He paid little attention to the many complaints of injustice which were coming from Scotland at this time but an offence against himself he did not so easily overlook as Burnet was now to experience. "Lauderdale had told the King," he says, "that I had boasted to his wife of the freedom I had "used with him upon his course of life. With this the "King was highly offended, or at least he made use of it to "justify many hard things that he said of me; and for "many years after he allowed himself a very free scope in "talking of me. I was certainly to blame for the freedom "I had used with the Duchess of Lauderdale; but I was "surprised by the question, and I could not frame myself "to tell a lie, so I had no shift ready to satisfy her."

The Duke of York, however, was still friendly. "He "carried me," says Burnet, "to the King, who received "me coldly. Some days after...the Lord Chamberlain "told me he had orders to strike my name out of the "list of chaplains, and that the King forbid me the "Court, and expected I should go back to Scotland. The "duke seemed troubled at this and spoke to the King "about it, but he was positive. Yet he admitted me to say "to him what I had to offer in my own justification. I said "all I thought necessary and appealed to Duke Hamilton, "who did me justice in it. But the King said he was afraid "I had been too busy and wished me to go home to "Scotland and be more quiet. The duke upon this told

"me that if I went home without reconciling myself to "Duke Lauderdale I would be certainly shut up in a close "prison, where I might perhaps lie too long."

Burnet liking neither alternative decided not to return to Scotland. The following is the letter in which he resigns his professorship.

LONDON, *September 10th*, 1674.

Rev. Sir,

Upon many cogent reasons I have given you this trouble to tell you that I have resigned like as by these presents I do resign my place of Professor of Theologie in your University, and I pray God direct you and the Faculty to make a worthy choice. I shall as soon as may be remove my things out of the lodgings. I hope that you will communicate this to the Faculty, and that both you and they will be so just as to believe that wheresoever I am I shall ever retain all the affection, duty, and gratitude for the great obligations you have put on me that can be expected from

Reverend Sir,

Your most oblidged and most humble servant,

G. BURNET.

So ended Burnet's Scotch career. He was only thirty-one, but already he had played an important part in public affairs. He and his colleagues had made a noble attempt to secure toleration in a bigoted age, and those who try to do justice to the elements of truth in contending parties undertake a hard task. Their efforts if not entirely successful, were not altogether made in vain. The period between 1668–74 has been aptly termed by Covenanting historians "the Blink"—that is, the brief spell of sunshine between the storms. How much these men did to stop savage religious persecution and to moderate the truculent temper of Lauderdale may be seen if we compare the years of their influence with the dark period of Scottish history which followed immediately.

In estimating the permanent value of their work we must be guided by the judgment of their countrymen. The trend of Scottish ecclesiastical history has been directly contrary to the Erastian principles of Leighton and Burnet, and the doctrine of passive obedience to which the latter clung so tenaciously never found any favour in Scotland. The history of the Established Church has been a slow but steady progress towards independence in orders, discipline, and creed. As little sympathy has been shewn with Burnet's view that it is impossible for the Presbyterian system to maintain peace and order in the church. In the most decided manner the Scots have shewn their preference for Presbyterianism. Leighton was more accurate in his reading of the national character when he made the reluctant admission "the genius of this church particularly lies much "towards synods and assemblies." Time has abundantly verified the statement. The Scottish Episcopal Church ignored the popular sentiment and has in consequence led a troubled and somewhat feeble existence since the Revolution. It still ranks as one of the smaller religious communities in Scotland, and its share in the national life has been relatively unimportant—in no other country indeed has Episcopacy exercised so little influence over the religious energies of the nation. It still claims to be the Church of Scotland, but beyond its own limits Scotsmen do not seriously consider the claim, because during the last two centuries by far the greatest part of the Christian work in Scotland has been done and the overwhelming majority of Christian lives have been lived outside the Pale of Episcopacy.

In another direction the national judgment has been more favourable. The Covenanters of the 17th century as we have seen were high-churchmen, firm believers in the Divine Right of Presbytery, ready to unchurch all who did not accept their favourite doctrine. Leighton and Burnet took the more moderate view that particular forms of government must not be reckoned among the essentials of the Christian Church. This view of theirs has found greater acceptance. There are few indeed of their countrymen who would ever dream of unchurching their fellow

Christians because of their preference for another ecclesiastical organisation. Scotsmen as a general rule take but a languid interest in the Divine Right of Presbytery or in the kindred theory the Divine Right of Bishops. Rightly or wrongly they have tacitly agreed to leave discussions on such questions to the smaller Scottish sects.

PART II.

ENGLAND.

1674—1715.

CHAPTER V.

LONDON UNDER CHARLES II. 1674–1685.

"[When] I resigned my Professorship," wrote Burnet, 35 years later, "[I] resolved to cast myself on the Pro-"vidence of God."

Humanly speaking, the outlook of the young Scotchman, thus stranded in London at the age of thirty-one, must have seemed sufficiently gloomy. His professional prospects appeared blasted; he had alienated all those from whom preferment could be expected. The patronage of the unpopular Heir could not compensate for the estrangement of the King. The "Grand Vizier" of Scotland had become his implacable foe; and yet the discovery of his clandestine marriage must inevitably embroil him with the Hamiltons, by whom Lauderdale was opposed. Nor could he longer trust to the friendship of Kincardine, now bound, by ties of interest, to Lauderdale's party. "I find" (wrote Kincardine to Lauderdale, August 18, 1674) "upon the back of your letter, which I had almost "missed taking notice of, that G. Burnet brags of his "interest in me, and of my friendship. I know no reason "why he should do so. I had not a letter from him, nor "he from me these 14 or 15 months. I did see him "at my chamber the Sunday at night before I left London "and he told me he had been with my wife before he came "away. I have a great kindness for many good things in "him, but I am as sensible as any other of the great want "he hath of prudence, and I attribute his late failings to "that rather than anything else, and yet I think this no "great compliment to him. I did write in my last letter "a touch [?] concerning him, which is still my opinion, and

"which I think...will be more cross to his inclinations than "punishments which may seem rougher. I have no con- "cern in it, for let him go where he will my sons shall go "no more under his care."

The young Divine was thus thrown completely on his own resources. His patrimony cannot have been large; and the fortune of his unacknowledged wife, though considerable in Scottish eyes, was probably modest enough when reduced to English currency. But Burnet had the dauntless spirit which so honourably distinguishes the Scot; and one sphere, at least, seemed open to his efforts. "I preached" (he says) "in many of the churches of "London, and was so well liked that...a church falling to "be given" by the votes of the parishioners "the electors "had a mind to choose me." His disgrace at Court however complicated the issue; the voters "were not willing to "offend the Court." Upon this the Duke of York again interposed for Burnet. He told Lauderdale (as Burnet puts it) "that he had a mind I should be settled in "London, and desired he would not oppose it. Lauderdale "said, all this was a trick of the" discontented "party in "Scotland...that I might be a correspondent between the "factious in both kingdoms." The Duke of York, however, persisted; he assumed a personal responsibility for Burnet's discretion; and the Minister had to yield. Nay, more, "seeing" (says Burnet) "what a root I had with the duke," Lauderdale offered Burnet his friendship if he would definitely break with Hamilton. This overture Burnet rejected: "I said I had promised the Duke" (of York) "to "meddle no more in Scotch affairs; but I could not forsake "my friends." Lauderdale's resentment revived; the King was induced to put pressure in the appropriate quarter; and Burnet lost the presentation.

Nor was this all. Archbishop Sharp, then in London, maliciously accused Burnet of having traduced Lauderdale to the English opposition. The Duke of York gave Burnet a timely warning; and when Secretary Coventry, on November 27, summoned the divine, and intimated the royal pleasure that he should remove 20 miles from London, Burnet at once transmitted to Coventry's royal principal an absolute disclaimer of the charges formulated against him.

It was corroborated by the noblemen implicated; but Lauderdale openly boasted that the quarrel should be "pushed" to the uttermost; and that Burnet, innocent or guilty, should be forthwith driven from London. In vain did Burnet, on November 29, request a regular trial, or at least a formal hearing; and, in fine, in the last resort, he demanded a written order. As such a command could have no legal validity, this move embarrassed his opponents; who (after another fruitless intervention on the part of the Heir Presumptive) fell back on the feeble expedient of forbidding Burnet the Court.

Exasperated by this persecution, Burnet took the very step with which his accusers had charged him; and impulsively exclaimed, to some members of the English opposition, that his crime was "knowing too much." Therewith he proceeded to detail the sinister terms in which Lauderdale had alluded to the mercenaries of Scotland and Ireland. The charge was one of a singular gravity; similar imputations, some thirty-four years earlier, had cost Strafford his head.

Burnet moreover seems to have emphasized in rather questionable fashion the complete reversal of his sentiments with regard to Lauderdale. It is maintained by Jacobite writers, on authority apparently good, that he attempted to suppress the eulogistic dedicatory pages prefixed to the *Vindication*. The London bookseller, Pitt, to whom the surplus copies had been sold refused to countenance the transaction; and a contemporary, twenty years later, in a letter addressed to Pitt, supplies some vivid details: "I went" (he says) "to your shop where I found lying "on your compter several" copies of the *Vindication*, "one of which I took up, and as I was reading in it, I "saw a tall clergyman (whose face was to me unknown) "coming out of the inward shop (you following him), "who by his looks and gestures seemed to be in a "very great passion; and as he parted from you at your "outward shop door, with a very severe frown, said to you, "in an angry loud Northern tone, Unless you do it, I will "never more have any dealings with you, and make you "repent it as long as you live."

Burnet, however (so at least runs the tale), himself

bought back the volumes, and abstracted the belated eulogy. Certain it is that copies which contain the "Dedication" are now described as "rare."

Meanwhile Burnet, despite his anger against Lauderdale, was naturally concerned to evince, to the satisfaction of Court and King, his own unshaken loyalty to the "Powers that be." On December 6, 1674, he preached an eloquent sermon on the "Dutiful Subject" or "Subjection for conscience sake asserted"; which was followed, on "King Charles' Day" succeeding, by another on the "Royal Martyr." These he soon after published, and we shall find them, in later years, more than once maliciously reprinted by the Jacobite press. This is not surprising; for their Royalism is decidedly effusive; and true Religion is painted as the most effective bulwark of the Throne. Burnet indeed reprobates the profane theories of Hobbes; the "pestiferous spawn" of the "infernal Leviathan" which undermine (while ostensibly supporting) the Governor's authority. His own hypothesis however treats the Magistrate as a Divine Vicegerent, responsible only to the Supreme. Subjects who abandon the attitude of submission (though on a "pretence of heroical excitations") are really moved by the "heats of a warm fancy"; or else, like the impious Uzzah, they "distrust the providence of God." The horrors of civil war (so lately exemplified in England) are contrasted with the patience of Christ and His martyrs; and Burnet insinuates, that if Hildebrand set the fashion of usurping on the civil authority, his example is imitated by many "who pretend a great heat against Rome....But (adds Burnet) "blessed be God, our Church hates...this "doctrine...and hath established the rights...of princes "on ... unalterable foundations; enjoining an entire obe-"dience to all the lawful commands of authority, and "an absolute submission to the supreme power God "hath put in our Sovereign's hands." Yet is easy to see, what Burnet himself may have ignored; that to him the Monarch as such is but the incarnate symbol of national unity and order. To the memory of Charles I meanwhile he is of course devoutly loyal; and gives copious extracts from his letters in the Hamilton *Memoirs*, then as yet unpublished. Thence (says Burnet) we may draw some

hints of "that murdered Prince's virtues"; to dilate on which were at once "endless" and "needless."

These sermons failed to mollify either the Minister or the King; but they cannot have failed to secure the approbation of the Duke of York. At odds with the Court, which had been forced to abandon the Papists, he now paid conspicuous attention to the disgraced divine. About Easter, 1675, Burnet was honoured with frequent audiences; he seems to have been initiated in some degree into the political confidence of the Heir Presumptive, and found him, as he tells us, "in the best temper I had ever "known him in." The Duke was immersed in the study of devotional literature; "and we had" (says Burnet) "much good discourse on that subject." But the preacher, to do him justice, did not flatter the prejudices of his patron. During the year 1674, Burnet had published one anti-Roman tract; and he now (in opposition to the Jesuit Ken) put forth a "Rational Method" of defending Anglican orthodoxy. This little pamphlet is an excellent example of Burnet's polemical gifts; for in dealing with the Roman controversy, he is seen at his best. The questions at issue specially appeal to the historian; since the premisses common to the parties are by both regarded as falling within the province of history. So far, moreover, he cannot be said to have shared the almost superstitious horror with which the Protestant devotee regarded his Roman rival. Certain aspects of Romanism, in fact, had exerted no little attraction over his own youthful fervour. The ascetic impulse had passed; but to the end of his life, devout and exemplary Romanists retained his esteem. Nor did he cease to extol, for the emulation of his own co-religionists the episcopal virtues of many Gallican bishops—the parochial reformation which (in France at least) dates from the Council of Trent. But his candour did not blind him to the other side of the dispute. Historical research had for Burnet finally exploded the fable of papal infallibility; and the political claims of the hierarchy called the Erastian to arms. His theological and scientific views disallowed the miracle of the Host, which appeals *from* the senses, instead of *through* them. His spiritual instincts recoiled

from mediæval ritualism—his common sense from mediæval superstitions; Jesuitical casuistry shocked his moral honesty; and cruel methods of repression repelled one essentially humane. In this and other anti-Roman tracts, moreover, ready learning, apt illustration, and lucid arrangement are woven into an eloquence homely enough, but vivid, nervous, sincere. His epigrams are often happy. Roman ceremonialism he defines as a "superannuated "Judaism"; and the "grave and useful" miracles of the four Gospels are contrasted with the "ridiculous" marvels of Roman hagiography. The logical methods of the schoolmen—the "Janissaries of debate"—he dismisses as obsolete; the modern apologist, transcending books and notions, must know "things" and "men." To Plato, geometry had seemed the porch of philosophy; and in Burnet's eyes "mathematical arts and sciences" are "a fit "and almost necessary" prelude to theological study. They foster, he says, the power of critical discrimination and "practice a man into an *exact* consideration" of all that is proposed to him.

But the friendship which had survived the strain of theological difference was now to succumb under stress of another kind. The English opposition, having shattered the ministerial "Cabal," had concentrated its attacks on the still impervious Lauderdale. Parliament met April 13, 1675. Within twenty-four hours the Commons appointed a Committee to formulate a demand for his dismissal; and Burnet, whose animadversions on the Minister had long been public property, was summoned to substantiate his charges in the presence of this Committee.

Bitterly did he rue the loquacity which had thus ensnared him. If he publicly sustained his accusation he stood liable to the charge of malice; to retract it was, in effect, to charge himself with untruth. Lamely enough he strove in the grasp of this dilemma.

On April 21 the Committee reported that Burnet had submitted to examination as regards his banishment from Court. He was also willing to retail the language held by Lauderdale in July—August, 1672; since the substance of those remarks had been reiterated to others. He

specially instanced the Duchess of Hamilton; who, so Mackenzie tells us, contradicted the assertion. As to later and more private converse he had however prevaricated; "If I do know anything, I beg your pardon if I make no "answer[1]."

On April 23, the House (having voted the address against Lauderdale) turned its attention to Burnet; and after a member had urged the duty of protecting him, if frank, from ministerial vengeance, he was again brought to the Bar. But Burnet persisted in his recalcitrancy. He reminded the House (so he assures us) that Lauderdale, under stress of passion, often spoke at random; and that delation, under the circumstances, would seem a treacherous move. In fine however, Burnet, ere he withdrew, submitted to the sense of the House.

An animated debate ensued. Some descanted on the probable importance of the evidence thus withheld; some dwelt on the efficacy of the Tower, as a solvent of scruples. Others cogently observed that Burnet, who admitted the fact of treasonable discourse, could hardly longer maintain that honour held his tongue.

His further interrogation followed. The Speaker warned him that in the event of continued obduracy, he would be "proceeded against accordingly." Thereupon "between fear and persuasion" the witness finally yielded. "[Mr] Burnet then said, He shall always pay obedience to "the authority of this House, as becomes him." He acquitted Lauderdale of expressing a formed *intention* to invade England from the North; but he gave, in full, particulars of the language employed by him. Some members were for cross-examination, with respect to the *antecedents* of the talk; but eventually the debate was adjourned.

It was now in Lauderdale's power to create a signal diversion. The *Vindication*, with its eulogistic introduction, *had appeared in the interval between the incriminating conversations*. The Secretary's presentation copy was probably in the North; but London was ransacked for an

[1] So the Ham House MS. *Grey's Debates* appends "till the utmost "extremity." Burnet declares [*Hist.* Airy's ed. II. 74] he added a rider to the effect, that the words, whatever their nature, did not amount to treason.

unmutilated specimen; and one at length came to light. A thousand copies (of the dedication?) were at once reprinted; and Lauderdale distributed them broadcast to the members of both Houses.

Burnet was thus most effectually "hoist with his own "petard." In vain would his friends have dismissed the dedication as a mere "compliment" paid to the Lord Commissioner of the day. The debate, again adjourned, was never more resumed.

Burnet's action on this occasion certainly invites criticism; but the censure it actually received is grossly exaggerated in its tenor. He had yielded to the resentment of the moment; he was charged with deliberate perfidy. In his most candid[1], and therefore most convincing account of the affair, he frankly admits his error; while his *History* lays special stress on the *inconsistency* of his conduct. He who had so strongly argued against clergymen meddling in business, had now engaged himself deeply in secular concerns. "The truth is" (he decides) "I had been for about a year in a perpetual agitation, and "was not calm nor cool enough to reflect on my conduct as "I ought to have done. I had lost much of a spirit of "devotion and recollection; and so it was no wonder if "I committed great errors." In the long run however the episode seemed a blessing in disguise. "Thank God" (he wrote, five-and-thirty years later) "it has proved a happy "deliverance from Courts and intrigues in which I was at "that time so far engaged." More especially it effected a complete breach between Burnet and the Papist Heir Presumptive; and he felt that but for this "the kindness "which was growing upon me to the Duke, might have "involved me into great difficulties, as it did expose me to "much censure."

Meanwhile, if the affair had ruined him in some quarters, it recommended him in others. Kincardine (with whom, as with all others, Duchess Lauderdale had now quarrelled) resumed relations with the divine; and thus forfeited for ever Lauderdale's patronage. The English opposition again could hardly abandon the man it had forced into so

[1] Autobiography [Supplement to *Hist. O. T.*, p. 484]. In the *Hist.* Airy's ed. II. 75 [fol. pag., p. 380] he tries to gloss the matter over.

false a position. At the instance of Lord Holles (his old Paris friend, and now an opposition leader), Burnet waited on Sir Harbottle Grimston, Master of the Rolls, who forthwith appointed him preacher at the Rolls Chapel. The appointment seems to have been worth about £100 a year; of which £10 was actually received from the Master of the Rolls, the remainder being made up by the Masters in Chancery. It was not a "benefice," and it "naturally determined" whenever the Mastership fell vacant. "The Court" (writes Burnet ingenuously) "thought me a "man of that consequence that they sent first a Bishop, and "then a Secretary of State, to prevail with [Grimston] to "dismiss me." Sir Harbottle, however, dwelt on his age; and took his stand on his need of appropriate ministration to prepare him for another world.

A fine old Puritan lawyer, Sir Harbottle had belonged to the constitutional opposition, *tempus* Charles I; but though "much troubled when preachers asserted a divine "right of regal government," had steadfastly opposed both the Covenant, and the Protector. His devout old wife (niece, says Burnet, "to the great Sir Francis Bacon") was "high" in her "notions for the Church and Crown," but unostentatiously beneficent; and their intimacy, says Burnet, added much to the happiness of his life in London.

"By this means" (he proceeds) "I had a settlement in "London in which I continued ten year all to one term. "That which made this look to me like somewhat of a very "particular providence was that, as it came to me without "any thought or procurement of my own, so it happened "at the very time (I think in the very week) that my "marriage came to be known, in Scotland; so it looked as "if God was watching over me for good, since I had the "face of a small subsistence to bring my wife to."

What caused the discovery we have no means of learning. Lady Margaret was apparently at Hamilton; whence she retired to Edinburgh, "condoling her own case, "and [her husband's] present misfortune."

The revelation caused a most unusual stir; and both parties (as Burnet himself puts it) were of course "severely "censured." The scandal ordinarily attaching to a clandestine union is naturally intensified when one of the

parties is in orders, and the other an elderly heiress; and Lady Margaret's Presbyterian intimates were peculiarly shocked by alliance with one that "was prelatic." Many hinted that Burnet, in delating Lauderdale, had but executed the vengeance of an unacknowledged wife on a former, and faithless, admirer. The Hamiltons were furious; and though somewhat mollified by the fact that Burnet renounced all claims upon the reversion of Lady Margaret's fortune, some members of the family always described him in very indecent terms.

Lady Margaret soon joined her husband; but the marriage, however loyal the parties, seems to have been as little successful as the majority of ill-assorted unions. To the quondam great lady, who had been for so long a force in ecclesiastical politics, her London sphere will have seemed exceedingly contracted. Her husband's position as minister of an establishment more episcopal, and more ritualistic than the established Church of Scotland, must have galled her Presbyterian sympathies. And we suspect that he suffered, as time went on, from the innocent, but embarrassing, jealousy almost inevitable in the elderly bride of a husband socially popular. "She had" (says Burnet) "many rare qualities, but she had some bad ones; she was "apt to mistake little things, and to fancy that her friends "neglected her; and upon these jealousies she was peevish "and bitter; but it was long before I observed these defects "in her." Moreover, her health soon failed. "She lived "with me" (says her husband) "13 years, but fell under "such a decay of memory and understanding that for some "years she knew nothing and nobody. In this" (he adds, with a quaint and characteristic mixture of chivalry and self-esteem) "I had a large occasion for patience, and for "a tender return of care to one that had laid so great an "obligation on me; and I thank God I went through that "*in a very singular manner.*"

Meanwhile we find him settled, for a period of nearly ten years, in that great capital which was perhaps to become, for the remainder of his life, the real home of his affections, though not the main scene of his labour; and in whose vast embrace he sleeps his last sleep. The London of which he now became a part was the London of Pepys,

already too blind, alas, to continue his famous diary; the London of Evelyn; the London so rapidly rising from the ashes of the great fire under the magic hand of Wren. St Paul's indeed was not to be completed for another forty years, but the new city steeples sprang up on every side. The Chapel of the Rolls, though protected citywards by a garden or close, had itself suffered from the flames; and had lost, during partial rebuilding, its mediæval look. It had probably assumed very much the appearance which it was to retain till replaced, ten years ago, by the Record Office Museum. The fine monuments still preserved there were *in situ* under Burnet; and then (as was the case till within the last half century) each available foot of floorspace supported the chests and presses which held the Chancery Rolls. The Master's Gallery however seems to have been a later addition.

Burnet now resumed with renewed fervour his proper vocation. "My spirits," he says [had been] "much "dissipated upon my coming to England for a year or "two; yet I thank God I recovered myself and returned "to my profession, and the exercises and studies belonging "to it." To the labours of his new post were soon added those attendant on the Thursday Lectureship at "St "Clement's Danes without Temple Bar," which still stands in solitary state, an island in the midst of the traffic, within easy reach of the Rolls Chapel[1]. No cure of souls attached to either office; and Burnet was thus able to devote himself, with concentrated zeal, to the work of the pulpit. His reputation rapidly increased; and he was in great request throughout the parishes of London, as a preacher of occasional sermons. Such success was the result of severe and continuous study: "I applied myself to preach" (he tells us) "with great care. It was only in term time that "I was obliged to preach; but I was employed in one place "or another in the vacation time. I hope I did some good "there; as appeared not only by the crowd at the Chapel of "the Rolls, but by many who seemed to have arrived "at a better sense of things and a change of life by my "ministry there."

[1] His *History* and the *Life* by his sons only mention "St Clements." The name of the Rector [*Hist. O. T.* Airy's ed. II. 441, fol. pag., I. 596] identifies the church.

The pulpit, in fact, was Burnet's most appropriate sphere. An orator by temper and training, he found there ample scope for his religious fervour and his childlike love of display; his talent as an expositor, and his passion for giving advice. His natural readiness had been so assiduously improved that no one hesitated to pronounce him the extempore preacher of his day. Archbishop Tillotson noticed that the best sermon he ever heard him deliver was preached on the spur of the moment; and it was notorious that the only discourse in which he was known to pause was also the only one which had been written out beforehand. He possessed all the external advantages which recommend a public speaker; a voice sonorous, if somewhat too powerful; apt, of occasionally excessive gesture; and a striking person. "He was," says Speaker Onslow, "in his exterior too the finest figure I "ever saw in a pulpit." All these external advantages however were but the instruments of a passionate sincerity. "I never," wrote Speaker Onslow, in the middle of the eighteenth century, "heard a preacher equal to him. "There was an earnestness of heart, and look and voice, "that is scarcely to be conceived, as it is not the fashion of "the present times, and by the want of which, as much as "anything, religion is every day failing with us." His ascendancy is illustrated by an anecdote which Onslow preserves. Burnet (contrary to his custom) had "preached "out the hour-glass." He thereupon "held it aloft in his "hand, and then turned it for another hour; upon which the "audience, a very large one for [the Rolls Chapel] set up "almost a shout for joy."

The first few years of his new life passed, as Burnet tells us, in a "very easy manner." His pen, no less than his tongue, was occasionally employed on professional themes. "I wrote," he says, "many little books which were all so well "received that they sold well, and helped to support me; "so that though I had no great plenty about me, yet "I was in no want of anything. I had great presents often "offered to me, but...I excused myself, in particular to the "sick, who sent much for me."

Nor was the stimulus of congenial companship lacking. In the metropolis, the chief benefices were at this time held

by men of the so-called "Rationalistic" or "Latitudinarian" school; which might be termed the Broad Church of the seventeenth century. Lloyd—learned and exemplary, if not very sagacious—held, with other preferment, "the greatest "cure in England," the parish of St Martin's, Westminster. Tillotson, Dean of Canterbury, whose sedate eloquence made him a model to the preachers of the day, was a Canon of St Paul's; and his tranquil wisdom gave him singular weight among the clergy of the diocese. A man of far more powerful intellect, Edward Stillingfleet, became in 1677 Archdeacon of London. With these men Burnet, in some respects, had much affinity. An offshoot of the Cambridge Platonism which Burnet, ten years earlier, had appreciated, the school had outgrown for good or evil the metaphysical mysticism of its founders. Intellectual candour, ecclesiastical tolerance, lenient orthodoxy, and a love of general principles were its main characteristics. Its tepid religious morality knew nothing of the emotional ardour which transformed Burnet's common sense; but like him it shrank, with impartial repugnance, from ceremonial superstition and fanatic zeal. Nor were other attractions wanting. Distinguished as preachers and apologists the early Latitudinarians were also exemplary pastors.

With Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and Lloyd, Burnet soon formed intimacies, which only death could break. Their influence is specially obvious in the literary domain. Their learning inspired Burnet to renewed intellectual activity; and he submitted, with touching docility, to their critical creed. They were, indeed, masters of the diction most in fashion under Charles II; shorn of Elizabethan splendour and early Caroline elaboration, it aimed, above all things, at the lucid and the correct. Burnet, in a curious passage on translation, no doubt embodies their teaching. "When a man," he says, "writes his own "thoughts the heat of his fancy and the quickness of his "mind carry him so much after the notions themselves, that "for the most part he is too warm to judge of the aptness "of words...and figures; so that he either neglects them "too much or overdoes them. But when a man translates, "he has none of these heats about then." But the preference of the deliberate to the spontaneous was in

Burnet's case utterly mistaken. The pedestrian propriety of Tillotson's moral essays was little suited to Burnet's impetuous talents and his oratorical training; he always wrote best on the spur of the moment. If his censors chastened the exuberance of his earlier manner, they ended by impairing its vitality; and in point of style the work on which he pinned his fame—the *History of his own Time*, was, in the long run, revised into utter insipidity.

But Burnet's associates were by no means mainly clerical. Chance had thrown him into the vortex of political society. He had settled in one of the three "Rows" which faced Lincoln's Inn Fields; the fourth side of the square being bounded by Lincoln's Inn Wall. In which "Row" his house stood we cannot ascertain; but it was "near the Plough Inn." The locality was then fashionable; and he found he had important neighbours.

"I happened" (he says) "...in looking for a house to fall "accidentally on the next house to Sir Thomas Littleton, "knowing nothing concerning him. But I soon found "that he was one of the considerablest men in the nation. "He was at the head of the opposition that was made to "the Court; and living constantly in town he was exactly "informed of everything that passed. He came to have an "entire confidence in me, so that for six year together we "were seldom two days without spending some hours "together. I was by his means let into all their secrets; "and indeed, without the assistance I had from him, "I could never have seen so clearly into affairs as I did. "We argued all the matters that he perceived were to be "moved in the House of Commons, till he thought he was "a master of all that could be said on the subject." Burnet's own alienation from Court of course accelerated the intimacy; and his utmost exclusive association with the Opposition, for a space of about four years, could not but have an influence on his political development.

The "Country" party of this date was recruited from various sources. In its ranks the remains of Presbyterian constitutionalism coalesced on the one hand with a small phalanx of semi-Republicans, and, on the other, with the most moderate among the heirs of Royalist tradition. It was with these that Burnet himself sympathised. Of

Shaftesbury, the most "advanced" of the leaders, he entertained a profound distrust. The crude Republicanism of Sydney, who returned some years later from exile, was yet more distasteful to Burnet, while Algernon's love of monologue and fondness for laying down the law disgusted the talkative Scot. But the heads of the more moderate section, Coventry, the able and the upright, and his brilliant nephew Lord Halifax (known to posterity as "the "Trimmer"), proportionally attracted Burnet. His subsequent *History*, indeed, so far as Halifax is concerned, is coloured by the circumstances of an intervening alienation. At this time however Burnet's admiration was only qualified by doubts as to the religious orthodoxy of his accomplished acquaintance.

But attached as Burnet was to the heads of the moderate opposition, he by no means subscribed to its entire political creed. Recent debates had practically committed the "Country" party to the dogma that extreme oppression may be opposed by physical force. From this doctrine, during many a subsequent year, Burnet ostentatiously dissented. He was never indeed, in the strictest sense of the word, a "Jure Divino" man. The mystic sanctity ascribed to *monarchical* government in general, or to given *dynasties* in particular, repelled his robust common sense; but the Royalist fervour of his youth was as yet by no means exhausted. Moreover to the Scotchman, steeped in the distracted annals of his own faction-ridden land, the legalization of resistance to the supreme authority seemed a mere premium on revolt; and a more than Polish anarchy the inevitable consequence.

Nor did Burnet, at this time, share the sympathies of the "Latitudinarians" and the moderate Parliamentary opposition for the Presbyterian dissidents. Extruded from the National Church by the Act of 1662 their position had been altered for the worse by the recent "Test Act" of 1673. This was of course primarily directed against the Papists; but its terms were such as to exclude all strict Dissenters, Protestant as well as Papist, from secular office. A project for the renewed "Comprehension" of the Presbyterian party within the limits of the State Church, had been mooted; and during the winter of

1674–5, Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Halifax had declared in its favour. Towards the close of the year 1675 their efforts were seconded in a curious tract, entitled "The Naked "Truth." Ascribed to "An humble Moderator," it was really written by Bishop Croft, of Hereford; and it occasioned the greatest excitement.

Though devoid of literary grace, the religious attitude of this piece is quite reminiscent of Leighton. It advocates moreover certain concessions, which, later on, were pressed by Burnet himself. None the less, at this moment, it incurred his strong reprobation. He was in the first flush of his enthusiasm for the Church of his adoption. The width of its formularies—its liturgical apparatus—its at this time hearty Erastianism, appealed, as the contemporary Church of Scotland could never have appealed, to his strongest instincts. Abuses, which disfigured its practical working, and against which he was to fulminate later on, had not, so far, been pressed on his notice. And, in the last place, the fate of the Scotch "Accommodation" proposals cannot at this time have disposed him to conciliate Presbyterians.

His *Modest Survey...of Naked Truth* is dated May 23, 1676, and was licensed, as anonymous, three days later. It charges the Moderator with presumption, and with exciting sectarian discontent. The relaxation of doctrinal subscription is strongly deprecated; the Articles are described as almost excessively liberal; nor, on the Free-will controversy could anything be more discreet, since both Calvinists and Arminians can sign with a clear conscience. Purely scriptural texts would encourage the Socinians, who swallow scriptural formulas. Ceremonies should not be rashly modified, since the charge of possible abuse can be brought against every rite; and proposals for change must emanate from the Dissenters themselves. Consideration may be due to consciences really tender; but the Church owes nothing to those "insolent sectaries," who have "rendered themselves obnoxious both in Church and State." He (Burnet) contravenes the Moderator's contention that the early Church, though appointing superintendent overseers, did not recognize distinct orders. This argument (he says) justifies the Presbyterian position. Distinction of function implies difference of order; and the spiritual

authority of the existing Episcopate is derived either from the Apostles, or, by delegation, from the body of the Church. The latter claim no one, as he thinks, will support. The Episcopal is the original order, from which the others derive. The Fathers clearly differentiate the apostolically-sanctioned orders from later accretions. The Foreign Presbyterians, deprived by untoward circumstances of Episcopal sanction, he dares not "unchurch." But English Presbyterians experience no such disability; and their ministers should not be received into the ranks of the established hierarchy, without a profession of penitence. Such are the arguments of this strongly "Anglican" tract.

The essential bond meanwhile between Burnet and the Parliamentary opposition was a common dread of Popery. For on April 2, 1676, the Duke of York, by finally dissociating himself from Protestant worship, set a defiant seal on his secession from the national faith; thus exciting the gloomiest anticipations in the minds of his future subjects. These "apprehensions" (to use Burnet's language) "obliged "us to study these controversies" with increased "appli-"cation."

Burnet himself was early called into the fray. For on April 3, 1676 (at the instance of a Protestant lady who had discovered her husband to be a papist), took place the celebrated conference between Burnet and Stillingfleet on the one hand, and certain priests on the other. It was remarkable for the arrogance with which an ill-fated Papist layman, Coleman, the Duchess of York's secretary, took the words out of the mouths of his own representatives. The report, by Burnet (with learned appendices by Stillingfleet), was soon after published; and "set me" (says Burnet) "as in the front of those who opposed "Popery." For this lady moreover Burnet subsequently wrote his tract on the validity of Anglican orders, as seen from the Roman standpoint. It is a learned, able, and to the lay mind singular tedious production. In it he alludes to his own orders as derived, at one remove, from the Anglican; assigns to *King and Parliament* the supreme legislative function; and asserts that the civil power (though unable to annihilate orders) can prohibit their exercise by an individual within its dominions.

This work also marks the beginning of a connection which was to last nearly thirty years. On his first arrival in England, Burnet's publishers had been Richard Royston ("bookseller to the King"), the great Royalist printer; and Moses Pitt, famed for his *English Atlas* and catalogues of foreign books. The quarrel over the dedication to Lauderdale did not sever his relations with Pitt, who published in 1676 the *Conference* and the *Survey of Naked Truth.* Henceforward however Burnet transferred his patronage to the press of Richard Chiswell ("at the Rose and Crown in St Paul's Churchyard") who had married Royston's daughter. From 1668 onwards he had been "rising...to the top of his profession"; and he was to become, ere his relations with Burnet ceased, the "first publisher and bookseller in the United Kingdom"—"the metropolitan bookseller of England if not of all the "world. His name at the bottom of a title-page," adds Dunton, "does sufficiently recommend a book. He has "not been known either to print a bad book, or on bad "paper."

The year 1677, meanwhile, gave birth to another work, embodying a different aspect of Burnet's many-sided genius. His friend, the saintly Professor Scougal, son of the Bishop of Aberdeen, and, like Burnet, a disciple of Leighton, passed through London in the long vacation of 1676; and there showed Burnet the MS. of his now famous devotional tract, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man.* Struck by its beauty, Burnet extorted from the author a consent to its anonymous publication, and himself saw it through the press. He further prefixed a brief but interesting introduction, directed against the minor immoralities of the day; and appended an Essay on the *Beginnings and Advances of a Spiritual Life, i.e.* the phenomena of so called religious "conversion."

This anonymous tract "written at the desire" of one "M.L.U.R."—who is elsewhere described as "a great "master of wit and language"—is usually ascribed to Burnet's own pen. "That there is a new Birth, and a "divine inward operation of the spirit of God, which does "constantly exert itself in the souls of the adopted sons of "God, but chiefly in their regeneration, is" (he says) "a

"truth so sacred and certain, that none who have any "acquaintance with the inward ways of God can so much "as question it." But since "the wild notions and worse "practices of some high pretenders" have "brought this "divine truth into some...disrepute with those who know "nothing of it," he must attempt to elucidate its nature. He will not enter into "a strict philosophical discussion of this "spiritual state." It is "better felt than defined." For though "a blind man may be taught...to make a very exact "discourse of...the nature of light and vision...yet every "plain, simple man with two eyes hath a truer" (if less philosophical) "notion of them." But he maintains that (since the Fall) only a special energy of the Divine can restore the idea of God to predominance in the individual mind. This energy takes the form of an emotional impulse, of which the proximate cause seems often fortuitous, and which is usually, though not always, sudden. Horror of sin, and fear of divine judgments are its first signs. Many persons "having laid down rules to God, raise scruples upon the "degrees of this horror and conviction"; but the only true criterion of regeneration is a real change of life. For often "the renewed man will even very early come to be above "those terrors of servile fear." Burnet discriminates between true religious fervour, and the nervous, or even sensual, excitement with which it is often attended and confused. He descants, moreover, on the danger of a man's tying himself to devotional forms; since "there is a progress in "the spiritual as well as in the natural life." He fulminates against those who suppose that the leadings of the divine spirit supersede Reason; if by Reason we mean, not the formal logic of the schools, but "the clear conviction of our "faculties." On the love of God and of man he dwells with the ardour of a Leighton; repelling the "Moham-"medan notion," which places fruition in external felicity rather than in a mystic union with the divine. A few practical remarks on constitutional weaknesses led to the avowal, that the writer's besetting temptation is "blasphe-"mous thoughts of God." These he has known "a torment "perhaps equal to a rack."

A year after the appearance of these tracts, Henry Scougal died. From a common friend, Burnet sought

materials for a memoir; ingenuously adding that as the shock must necessarily kill the Professor's aged father, matter for the Bishop's biography should be also supplied, and the two *Lives* might appropriately appear bound in a single volume. The friend seems to have communicated with the Bishop. But he, in whom the memory of Burnet's early indiscretion evidently still ranked, promptly vetoed the project. When consulted later, on his deathbed, with respect to a posthumous biography, he made only one stipulation. The biographer, at any rate, should *not* be Burnet. "Whether he loves or hates," said the old prelate, "he is immoderate....If he should intend to commend me, "his encomium would be worse than a satire."

Meanwhile Burnet was projecting more important efforts. The appearance of the Hamilton *Memoirs* (licensed in 1673) had been unaccountably postponed. Late in 1677, however, with its original dedication to the King, the work at length saw the light; forming, as Mr Clarke has told us, Volume II of a *History of the Church of Scotland*, with Spottiswoode's *History* as Volume I. Like most works which tread "per ignes suppositos cineri doloso" it created a great stir; and it was vehemently applauded in the ranks of the opposition. Sir William Jones, the Attorney General, a friend of the "Country" party, pronounced Burnet "cut out" for the writing of history; and wished him to undertake a general History of England. But as it happened Sanders' virulent diatribe against "The English Schism" had recently appeared in a new French translation. The excitement it occasioned in continental circles seemed to demand a counterblast, especially in view of the impending Papist Succession. Burnet's anti-papal pamphlets of course marked him out. "All my friends" (he says) "conclude[d] I was the fittest man to answer "it....So now all my thoughts were turned that way." He started collecting materials for a *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*; and the first volume, devoted to the Reign of Henry VIII, cost him more than two years' labour.

For such a work Burnet possessed considerable qualifications; a warm and intelligent interest in the questions at issue; the unusual width of outlook which makes for sanity

of judgment; and the broad practical acquaintance with books and men which is the best equipment for the historian. His masculine common sense perceived that a movement may be in substance beneficial, which it would nevertheless be impossible to justify in every detail. His Erastianism enabled him to sympathise with the peculiar features of the English revolt from Rome. Yet, as a Scotchman, he could regard the struggle with a "detachment" which he sometimes lacks, where personal prepossession is more acute.

Nor does he, in the actual treatment, fall below his theme. Burnet's *Reformation* forms an epoch in our historical literature. Behind him lie Raleigh and Bacon, Herbert and Camden; he is the first of our historians who is still regarded as readable. Religious enthusiam, latent but passionate, fuses the whole work into an almost epic unity, wherein Burnet's other histories appear singularly deficient. He is not a very vivid narrator; but here incident is but the link between those controversial episodes, in the treatment of which he excels. To the methods of his continental predecessors he devoted a careful study; reading, and rereading, four or five times, the monumental masterpiece of Father Paul. Free from that idolatry of the classics, which was the bane of early historians, his conception of history appears essentially modern. Ranke has laid stress on his passion for primitive sources of information. Originally excited by the conversation of his father, it had been whetted by patristic studies, and the Hamilton investigation, and was now further stimulated by the example of Stillingfleet and Lloyd. His indefatigable energy ransacked available sources; generous friends, such as Boyle, supplied funds for transcription; and the result is a documentary apparatus, which inspires the specialist with respect.

But the medal has its reverse. The defects of the history are as conspicuous as its merits. Burnet's preliminary knowledge of the subject was by no means thorough; and since, in order to retort promptly upon Sanders, he was really working against time, he lacked adequate leisure to repair his own deficiences. He was still hampered by the enmity of Lauderdale, who supposed

him to be the connecting link between Scotch and English factions; and who succeeded in exciting the suspicions of the antiquary Cotton[1], whose series of Reformation manuscripts was at the time unrivalled. Burnet, at this date, obtained but a brief and more or less surreptitious inspection of the Cotton treasures; during which he and his Scotch amanuensis[2] worked at breakneck speed. They were both new to the orthography of the records; and the invaluable assistance of Petyt the archivist was not always available. Nor was Burnet's impetuous genius suited to the task of transcription. The minute vigilance required fretted his active spirit; a rapid imagination often jumped at a conclusion; and he seems to have specially chafed against the demands of chronological precision. His handwriting, which retained some Scotch peculiarities, seems to have puzzled his printers; and he was not sufficiently scrupulous in revising his proofs. In fine, his learned editor, Pocock, who devoted to the correction of his blunders almost as many years as Burnet occupied in making them, claims to have rectified in the earlier editions "about ten "thousand downright mistakes." Most of these, of course, are trivial inaccuracies which do not affect the validity of Burnet's conclusions. But some—such as his famous perversion of Luther's eucharistic views—are as serious as they are gross.

His editor, however, emphatically repudiates the charge of deliberate falsification, which was advanced by the malice of adversaries, personal, political, or clerical. Into the controversies thus provoked we do not propose to enter. His opponents were remorseless; and Burnet, though desirous of advice from responsible quarters, showed himself, where he suspected a hostile animus, ludicrously sensitive. And the acrimonious application of the personal argument,

[1] With this cf. Dugdale's letter to Cotton, December 20, 1677. [Brit. Mus., Sloan MSS. 4162 f. 224; copy.] He mentions that Burnet, as a Scotchman, cannot be credited with any special knowledge of English affairs; and says that the fact of his blaming the Scottish Bishops, in the Hamilton *Memoirs*, for the origin of the rebellion, gives no great idea of his episcopal orthodoxy. Dugdale seems to have been incited by several English Divines. See also Pocock's edition *Hist. Reform.* VII. 1–3. The suggestion in Burnet's *History* that Lauderdale represented Burnet to Cotton as an "enemy to the prerogative" seems rather an anachronism. [*Hist.* Airy's ed. II. 107, fol. pag., I. 396.]

[2] Adam Angus. See Cole's note to *Hist.* Airy's ed. II. 164 [fol. pag., I. 429].

characteristic of 17th century polemics, was conspicuous in the wordy wars with Lowth, Parker, Le Grand, Varillas, Hickes, Anthony à Wood, Henry Wharton, etc., etc., etc.

The preparation and revision of his initial volume absorbed the end of 1677 and the first part of the year 1678. In the autumn, however, a startling incident drew Burnet once more into the vortex of political passion. Popery, here also, was the topic.

Some years before, at Sir Robert Moray's, Burnet had come across a crazy parson called Tonge, who posed as an "[al]chemist" and "projector." On September 26, 1678, this man presented himself to Burnet, with extravagant stories of a Popish Plot, directed against the life of the King in the interests of his brother's succession. Burnet, naturally alarmed, but unable to approach the Court, applied to Lloyd; and induced him to report the matter at the Secretary's office. Lloyd found that Tonge was already in touch with the officials; but that his tale was little regarded. Burnet then spoke to Littleton, and found him equally callous. Halifax however shewed his usual acumen. The nerves of the body national, he noted, were already at tension, on the score of the duke's religion; such stories, once published, must, he prophesied, excite uncontrollable fury.

His forecast was terribly fulfilled. Two days later, Oates, the associate of Tonge, began his perjured denunciations. The Coleman of the Burnet Conference was his first victim, and among the unhappy man's papers lay a compromising correspondence with France, undertaken in the Papist interest. The matter became public; and frantic excitement ensued.

Within forty-eight hours, Tonge sent for Burnet, to Whitehall, where the two informers were established. Their conduct disgusted him. Tonge's weak brain seemed turned by his sudden importance; and Burnet recoiled with horror from his loathsome comrade, who boasted he had played the Papist only that he might act the spy. Oates paid Burnet the "compliment" of including both him and his ally Stillingfleet among those marked for vengeance in the list of the Papist committee. But Burnet, with some humour, describes an honour as "cheap" which was shared with such men as Tonge.

A few days later, while walking, Burnet met Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, an active magistrate, who had taken Oates' depositions. He seemed depressed, and avowed a fear of assassination. Soon after, he disappeared; and as the result of a five days' search his corpse was discovered in a ditch "about a mile out of town, near St Pancras Church." To the populace—and indeed to many others—murder by the papists seemed the only possible solution. The fabrications of Oates were unquestioningly swallowed; subordinate villains, lured by the prospect of reward, soon appeared to corroborate his legends; and "the Dreyfus "scandal of English History" was now in full career.

What were Burnet's own sentiments? Here we are somewhat at a loss. His original memoirs are at this point defective; and the subsequent *History*, on such matters, is sometimes anachronistic. This insinuates that Burnet rose superior to the current, which swept the credulous Lloyd completely off his feet. The positive traces of dangerous Popish intrigue (as revealed in the Coleman correspondence) justified, Burnet maintains, measures of *legislative* repression; but he declares that he deprecated *criminal* proceedings upon evidence so discreditable as that of Oates. Hollis and Halifax, he says, expressed their concurrence in these sentiments; but Shaftesbury treated as "public enemies" all who "undermined the credit of the "witnesses." These threats notwithstanding, Burnet frankly warned the opposition and the authorities against a disreputable Scot, an "agent provocateur" of Lauderdale's, who appeared among the plot witnesses. His information became public; and he incurred on all sides great odium. Lauderdale sneered at his tenderness for would-be regicides; the "Country" extremists, aware of the King's disbelief in the plot, accused Burnet of an attempt to curry favour. "And so inconstant a thing is popularity" (adds Burnet) "that I was then most bitterly railed at" by many former friends. "I was advised by some not to stir abroad "for fear of public affronts. But these things did not "daunt me."

Yet though Burnet, on this occasion, had the courage of his conviction, it is certainly not true that the evidence left him cold. During the crisis he published anonymously

four anti-Roman pamphlets, of which only one is purely theological. In the others he argues that the deposition and outlawry of heretic kings, by fiat of the Roman See, is an integral part of the Roman system; reminds his readers of the Bartholomew massacre; and maintains that the doctrine of reservation discounts the dying asseverations of the "Plot" victims. The pieces are avowedly topical; in none is the slightest doubt cast on the validity of the evidence for the Crown; and their publication, while the trials were still in progress, had an obviously inflammatory tendency. Burnet, in fact, in his later works, credits himself with too much contemporaneous perspicacity. Like the rest of his countrymen he certainly lost his head. But he recovered his balance with commendable rapidity; and, from the first, had the candour to admit that denunciation and guilt were not convertible terms.

Meanwhile his intervention on behalf of an accused man had made its impression at Court. It seems to have convinced the King that Burnet was either more moderate, more simple, or more cunning than his "Country" associates; and he conceived the idea of employing him as a tool. About the middle of November, 1678, the Duke of Hamilton's brother brought overtures to the divine. Burnet was bidden to a secret audience; hints were dropped as to the service he could render. The See of Chichester moreover, was described as available for a man that should "come entirely" into the Royal interest. "I said," proceeds Burnet, "I understood not the importance of those "words. I knew what the oaths were which I was to take; "these I should observe faithfully, but for other promises I "would make none." As to services he was equally cautious. "I asked if he fancied I would be a spy or "betray anybody....But he undertook...that the King "should...in all things leave me to my liberty."

Burnet's vanity, and perchance something of a nobler ambition, took the bait offered in vain to his cupidity. The proposal, no doubt, flattered his self-esteem. To be solicited by a king is no common event; and the condescension is the more alluring to a recipient who has known disgrace. The confidant moreover of Court and Country, what might he not effect? Prospects so dazzling

blinded him to the essential facts of the situation. He was intimate with the opposition. Intercourse with the Court, to be honest, must be open.

The first interview was delayed; and ere it took place Burnet succumbed to the inevitable pitfalls of such duplicity. "A bill," he says, "passed in both Houses for raising all the "militia....I found some of them hoped, when that Bill "passed into a law, they would be more masters. I gave "the King notice...[On November 30] he rejected the Bill... "and thanked me for the advice." We have here a breach of confidence which, under the circumstances of the case, falls little short of treachery.

The audience duly took place; and was the prelude to several others. These stolen interviews occurred, by appointment, at Whitehall, in no very reputable locality; the "backstairs" apartments of the notorious Chiffinch. The King came alone, and "kept" (says Burnet) "the time "he assigned me to a minute." He "talked much and "very freely....We agreed," says Burnet, "in one thing that "the greatest part of the evidence was a contrivance." The King evinced fears of a rebellion: "I assured him," says Burnet, "I saw no appearances of it." Burnet however warned his Sovereign of rumours which imported his Majesty's desire to legitimate the Duke of Monmouth. The King sharply retorted, that much as he loved his son, he had rather see him hanged; but seemed not ill-pleased with such reports, as calculated to postpone revolt. He declined to admit the possibility of his brother's reconversion; agreed with Burnet in reprobating attacks on the Queen; and affected some sense of his own immoralities, a topic on which Burnet waxed bold. Burnet also endeavoured to press home the necessity for ministerial changes; and foreshadowed a plot against the unpopular chief minister Danby, of which Burnet knew no details.

Ere long, as was natural, Burnet incurred the penalties of his ambiguous intercourse. It had become known, or at least suspected, that he had revealed to the King[1] in-

[1] Whether this was the real motive underlying the Militia Bill, mentioned above; or whether it was the fact that Coleman, when examined before the Committee of the House of Commons, had implicated the Duke of York in his own negociations with France, cannot be certainly known.

formation, confided by Grimston. He thus lost Grimston's respect and confidence; and his general reputation received a permanent shock.

Moreover (as Burnet says) the King "thought I was "reserved to him, because I would tell him no particular "stories nor name persons." About the beginning of January, therefore, "I" proceeds Burnet "told him, since "he had that opinion of me I saw I could do him no "service, and would trouble him no more; but he should "certainly hear from me if I [learnt] anything...of con-"sequence to his person or government."

The attack on Lord Danby, foretold by Burnet, was not long delayed. By the end of April he was in the Tower, on a charge of high treason; and a general election—the first for eighteen years—had given the "Country" party an overwhelming majority. The Privy Council was recast in its favour; and the opposition, to use a modern term, had "come into power."

About a month later—May 23, 1679—the *History* [of Henry VIII's] *Reformation* passed the licenser. It seems to have been rushed through the press; and appeared, during Trinity term, in one volume folio.

Few books have ever enjoyed a more complete "succès "d'occasion." The Protestant fervour of the country had reached its height; the Protestant party was triumphant. The merits of the work lay obvious; its errors awaited the research of the contemporary Dry-as-dust. Its appearance was therefore followed by a burst of applause; and every facility was lavished for the preparation of a second volume. A Royal Warrant, dated July 11, 1679, gave renewed access to the Paper Office; the MSS. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, became instantly available; and Burnet spent part of the summer with the Master of St John's. Cotton threw open his library; the Chancellor and Lord Russell (leader of the House of Commons) sent liberal funds for research; while the wealthy Halifax, ignorant of those arrangements, offered Burnet a munificent pension, which Burnet gratefully declined.

Success meanwhile was acting as a solvent on the triumphant majority. The Popish heir, at the King's request, had retired to a continental retreat; but opinions

differed as to the future. Lord Shaftesbury—with, as was surmised, an eye on the Duke of Monmouth—pressed for the "Exclusion" of the dreaded heir. A more moderate party, headed by Lord Halifax, preferred to "limit" by legislation the powers of a Popish King.

With the latter party Burnet at first appears to have sided. He was no dynastic devotee; and he does not seem to have questioned the *competency* of the Legislature to exclude. But influenced by Halifax (then at the zenith of his powers), he believed that an "exclusion" must entail civil war. He therefore employed all his credit with "Country" politicians in favour of "Limitation."

Backed by the King, the Moderates at first triumphed. A sudden illness however brought the King to death's door; and the Moderates, fearing a "coup d'état" in favour of Monmouth, recalled the Heir Presumptive. He speedily regained an ascendency in the councils of the Court; and, regarding with impartial abhorrence the two popular parties, he soon reduced the "Country" ministers to a common impotence. "Lord Halifax," says Burnet, "fell ill, much "from a vexation of mind." His condition seemed serious; and Burnet was professionally concerned. "For a fortnight "together," he says, "I was once a day with him; and "found then that he had deeper impressions of religion on "him than those who knew the rest of his life would have "thought....My being much with him...was reflected on; "it was said I had heightened his dissatisfaction to the "Court...though I was with him only as a divine." About the middle of January, the Minister, in disgust, retired to his Rufford estates; and four other "Country" Privy Councillors soon resigned their seats. The experiment of the Spring had failed; the "Country" party was "out."

To Burnet the crisis seemed acute. He resolved to expostulate with the King; and a second motive clinched his resolution. The greed and power of the reigning mistress, the accredited agent of France, were at this moment the theme of violent invective. Now six months earlier Burnet, at her own request, had attended a dying woman, who had been a favourite of the King's. Remorse had overwhelmed her; and Burnet had urged her to discharge it in a letter of admonition to Charles. Her death

had prevented this; but she had left with Burnet messages of warning for her royal paramour. Under these circumstances, on January 29, 1679–80, Burnet addressed to Charles II the celebrated letter of remonstrance, first published, more than fifty years later, in the *Life* by his son. It is there professedly printed from Burnet's own draft; but a careful collation with the original now in the Bodleian Library reveals the curious fact that the published version is garbled. Fearful of adverse comment the editor has not only improved the grammar, but modified everything which could be tortured into a hint that Burnet had acted the spy. He has deleted, as savouring of "enthusiasm" all claim of divine commission; and has omitted some terms of effusive loyalty, at odds with the incidents of Burnet's later career. We print such variations in italics.

A brief exordium leads up to a purview of the actual situation. "...I never discovered anything like a design "of...rebellion among all those with whom I *have* conversed "*for had I perceived that I should have most certainly* "*informed your majesty of it*; but...most people grow "sullen and are highly distrustful of you." Petitions are to be signed in favour of an immediate session; and in case of a general election, the promoters of such addresses will generally succeed at the polls. The "soberer sort" declare against disorder, hoping that the King's necessities will ere long force his hand. "*What those of other* "*tempers project I know not for I am familiarly acquainted* "*with none of them.*" Supply will hardly be granted, save on exorbitant terms; "the things that will be demanded, "will not be of...easy...digestion...or indeed [such] that it "will be reasonable or honourable for you to grant them."

Burnet then proposes the remedy. "There is," he says, "one thing, and indeed the only thing, which all honest "men *with whom I keep company* agree in, as that which can "easily extricate you out of all your trouble. It is not the "change of a minister or of a council, a new alliance or "a Session of Parliament, but it is (and suffer me to "speak it with more than ordinary *assurance and* earnest-"ness) a change of your own heart, and of your course of "life. And now, sir, if you do not with indignation throw "this paper from you, suffer me (with all the humility that

"becomes *one who as he was born* your subject, *so vows he* "*will be ever ready to die for your service and as lying* "prostrate at your feet, to tell you that all the distrust your "people have of you, all the necessities you are now in, all "the indignation of Heaven that is on you and appears "in the defeating of all your counsels, flow from this that "you have not feared nor served God, but have given your- "self up to so many sinful pleasures. Your majesty may "perhaps justly think that many of those who do oppose "you have no regard to religion, but the body of your "people do consider it more than you may imagine. I do "not desire your majesty to put on a hypocritical shew of "religion, as Henry the Third of France did...that would "be soon seen through, and as it would provoke God more, "so it would increase jealousy....[But] if you will but turn "yourself to religion sincerely and seriously, you shall quickly "find a serene joy of another nature possess your mind "than what rises from gross*er* pleasures. God would be "at peace with you, and direct and bless your counsels, "and all good men would presently turn to you, and ill men "would be ashamed and have a thin party, for...there is "nothing which has so alienated the body of your people "from you as what they have heard of your life which disposes "them to give an easy belief to all other scandalous "reports." Burnet recalls the disastrous effect which the Royal example, during a period of twenty years, has had on public morality. "I am" (he adds) "no enthusiast "neither in opinion nor temper; yet I shall acknowledge I "have *for a great while* been so pressed in my mind to "make this address to you, that I could have no rest till "I did it; and since you were *graciously* pleased to *allow* "*me leave* [direct me (printed version)] to send you through "Mr Chiffinch's hands what informations I judged fit to "convey to you, I hope you will not be offended, if I have "made this use of that liberty. *I have not done it but after* "*much prayer and fasting;* and I am sure I can have no "other design in it but your majesty's good; for I know "this is not the method to serve any end of mine...." In an unpublished postcript he refers to the commission received from the dead woman, Mrs Roberts. This he will deliver in person if allowed an audience.

He left the letter, at seven o'clock the same evening, at Chiffinch's lodgings. Two days later, the Duke of Hamilton's son, then in waiting, told Burnet he had held the candle while the King accorded a first, and then a second, perusal to a paper in Burnet's hand. Charles had then reverted, a third time, to the beginning; *i.e.* to the political information, for which alone he cared; and had then, without a word, thrown the manuscript on the fire.

The King himself never acknowledged the letter, but spoke of Burnet, subsequently, "with great sharpness." His displeasure, though not its cause, seems to have become generally known. Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, the most brilliant libertine of the day, was now, in the intervals of failing health, turning to graver interests. He had read with appreciation the first instalment of the *Reformation*; and now told the King "he wondered why he would use "a writer of history ill; for such people can revenge them-"selves." Charles characteristically retorted (as Burnet himself reports), "I durst say nothing while he was alive; "when he was dead he should not be the worse for what "I said."

Thus ended an episode, more creditable to Burnet's professional courage than to his political discernment. The reformation of the Royal morals, however much to be desired, could not certainly, at this stage, have affected the political deadlock.

During the first six months of the year 1680, Burnet was hard at work on the second instalment of his history. He appears to have visited Oxford early in the Long Vacation; the rest of the time was spent in London. The intervals of his more sustained labour seem to have produced a remarkable tract on the "Infallibility of the Roman "Church"; which, though little known, is one of his most characteristic productions. "That [the] Catholic Church is "the Roman...seems" (he premises) "a bull as plainly as "a General Particular." "Reason," he proceeds, "[is] the "only part of our nature that was born to liberty, and can "defy all the severe rigours of Tyranny....Whatever power "the Civil Magistrates or the guides of the Church may "have over my actions or profession of my faith, yet as "long as it keeps within my head and breast (its natural

"dwelling-place), it is a violation of the sacredness of that "sanctuary to invade it...or make it prisoner. And when "I further consider that reason is nothing but a com- "munication of Divine light to make me understand those "propositions, of which some hints were born with my soul, "and the rest are offered to me in sacred writings, if "I throw off this, and betake myself to the dictates of "others, I exchange the sun for the moon." Meeting the argument that an infallible guide is indispensable for the Church, he admits, indeed, that "our blessed Saviour" will have provided those for whom He died with all things essential to salvation. But miraculous infallibility of *mind* was not, he argues, so valuable to this end as miraculous infallibility of *will*; which latter none dare claim. Knowledge and faith (after all) are but means to a good life; heresy, according to St Paul, is but one among the works of the flesh; why is not supernatural provision made against the others? The humble and reverent believer cannot help his sincere belief. A distincter conviction is of course required ere we disturb another's faith; the guides of the Church must try the innovator by Scripture, and their censure will always carry weight. Moreover the Church can excommunicate; the magistrate fine and banish those held inimical to the peace of the body; and he who decides to follow God rather than man must meekly accept the consequence. What need then of an infallible judge? Innocent error cannot compromise our salvation; the magistrate, though not infallible, can maintain the public peace. Moreover infallibility—a vast claim—needs vast proof for its substantiation. Miracles and purity of doctrine serve, in the Scriptures, as tokens of divine Commission. Even admitting, therefore, the need of an infallible judge, where shall we seek—how try him? The Eastern Churches were the older, the richer in martyrs, most esteemed in the great Councils; "I am tempted" (says Burnet) "to seek "this judge there: but when I see in what ignorance they live, "and how the pressures they groan under, though they have "not prevailed on them to renounce the name of Christ, "yet have brought them to a degenerate mean[nes]s which "I love not to dwell on...since the circumstances they are "in plead pity rather than scorn....I am forced to turn

"away from them." But when he looks upon the triumphant Church of the West, is the sight more impressive? "The piety "to which she pretends is either immured in her cloisters, or "appears only in faces and outward postures of devotion: "[and] after my most impartial enquiries, I can see no reason "to esteem the Head of this Church [such] a Saint, or such "a Clerk, that I must adore his person and submit to his "decrees." Again, where may this supposed infallibility reside? With admirable temper, and a logic truly merciless, does Burnet dissect the various explanations given by the Roman Schools; the divergent claims of Pope, Conclave, Council. In fine, the promise of an infallible guide dwindles down into the order to obey one's priest; while priests, it is known, differ. "And now, Sir," he tells his opponent, "after I have led you through a great many thickets and "enclosures, I am afraid I leave you in a labyrinth....And "I choose rather than engage in so dangerous a passage to "take the sacred writings which you and I both acknow-"ledge to be divine, and peruse them with all serious care, "hoping that God will so direct me, that if I be not wanting "to myself, I shall not err in any matter of salvation."

Meanwhile, despite these complicated labours, Burnet found time for voluminous correspondence. Much of this concerned the manuscript and proofs of the *History*; being directed to the learned antiquary, Fulman, who rendered invaluable assistance.

We also find traces of an active correspondence between Burnet and "Mr James Fall" (a pupil of Leighton's), afterwards Principal of Glasgow University and editor of Leighton's works. He had been tutor to Lord Kincardine's eldest son, one of Burnet's old pupils, whose death Burnet deplores in a letter of February 17, 1679–80. With his usual frank generosity Burnet offered the young pedagogue out of place an asylum in his own house. Fall however preferred to accept an appointment as travelling tutor to Lord Queensbury's son, which took him to Paris. In writing thither, Burnet incidentally mentions that he had himself intended a visit to Scotland, but that his friends had dissuaded him.

A still larger share of Burnet's disposable attention was devoted to Lord Halifax, who spent the summer in seclu-

sion at his seat of Rufford. Burnet's letters to the statesman in retreat are very good reading. He professed himself absorbed in research. "I told one that asked "me [for] news two days ago I was very well furnished "with a great deal, but it was all about a 130 years old; "being now almost all the day long in the Cotton library. "...In this place of news and talk it is some happiness to "have one's head full of anything that either keeps out or "soon drives out the impression which the things he sees or "hears makes upon him." But this fictitious detachment from contemporary interests could not long be maintained. "I cannot" (Burnet ingenuously admits) "sit so close but "the hum of the town finds me out." In plain English he was fully abreast of political gossip; and these letters are practically "news-letters" which shew us the *History of my own Time* in the making. Like the majority of postal communications in the 17th century they are marked by a certain reticence; the most individual touches convey Burnet's admiration for his noble correspondent, qualified by regrets at his supposed heterodox speculations. Burnet's references to the dramatic "conversion" of the dying Lord Rochester involve an obvious implication.

Rochester (already attracted by the *Reformation* historian) had been further prepossessed in his favour, by his firm yet kindly treatment of a dying penitent, who had been Rochester's mistress. The obvious indifference of the divine for ecclesiastical preferment had enhanced the favourable impression; and after several accidental meetings, Rochester, in October, 1679, had obtained a formal introduction. During the six months following their intercourse had been frequent; and Rochester had laid bare in talk with Burnet his objections to religion in general and Christianity in particular. He himself professed a vague naturalistic Deism; believed in a survival of "the soul" but not in continuity of consciousness; and shame for the excesses of former debauchery was qualified by the belief that sensual desire, as natural to man, is unnaturally restricted by monogamy. Burnet's arguments, if they did not entirely "subdue" Rochester's understanding at least impressed it. By April, 1680, when he left London for the Ranger's Lodge, Woodstock, "he was not," says Burnet,

"arrived at a full persuasion of Christianity," but he no longer scoffed; and declined to propagate irreligion. He had resolved on a complete moral reformation, and had resumed the practice of prayer. "The touching his heart" however, "was that," says Burnet, "which God reserved "for himself." While listening to one who read aloud the prophecies of Isaiah he had been overwhelmed by a rush of religious conviction; and died the passionate votary of the faith he had scorned.

Meanwhile Burnet's own concerns were in frequent agitation. His friend Lloyd was vacating St Martin's, Westminster, for the Bishopric of St Asaph. St Martin's, the chief London parish, was a living in the Lord Chancellor's gift; and Halifax seems to have hoped that Burnet might succeed. On July 17 we find Burnet acknowledging these good wishes, but with little expectation of their realization; "You know how I am stated too well to "think they can have effect." It was rumoured that the incumbent of Covent Garden might remove to St Martin's; and Russell, the "Country" leader, commended Burnet to his father, Lord Bedford, the patron of the former living. "What he resolves" (writes Burnet) "I do not know; for I am "now so hot at work about my History that I scarce see any-"body [save?] on Thursdays and Sundays." The suggested arrangement, however, cost Patrick St Martin's. "If I am "now," writes Burnet, "in such a character, God knows "what I am to expect when I have finished my History. "I have been close at it now a month, and am at present "pretty far in Queen Mary's reign, but I have met with so "many passages which have not been known before, that "will be thought such [as] if they had [been] laid together "on design to cross the Duke's interest; so that except "I prevaricate I must resolve to be for ever under his high "displeasure; but I shall tell truth, and am not accountable "for the use others will draw from it."

This excellent principle Burnet carried into practice in other and contrary quarters. On September 2nd—anniversary of the Great Fire—he preached to the City Corporation, a strongly "Exclusionist" body. The sins of the trading classes, and the nemesis of party passion, are the themes of this unsparing tirade.

That autumn the success of his published *Reformation* volume earned for Burnet a compliment which he no doubt valued. Early in October, at the instigation of Archbishop Sancroft, the University of Oxford conferred on Burnet a Divinity Doctor's degree.

Meanwhile he was rapidly completing the narrative of his second volume. It was written *currente calamo*; and having been commenced in July, was, after six weeks' work, completed early in September. In its preface, dated September 10, Burnet professes his loyalty for the Church of his adoption. But the high-water mark of his Anglican fervour had been reached long before and where he had formerly praised he now saw much to condemn. In this preface, for the first time, he animadverts on those corrupt practices so obvious, in the long run, to one educated under other auspices. Pluralities—non-residence—the inequality of parochial endowments—the absence of penitential discipline—the abuses of the Ecclesiastical Courts—excite his unsparing censure. Nor are we surprised to find that the sense of evils which cried aloud for redress renders him thenceforth gentler to those who had left the fold.

The work was at once put to the press; and despite Fulman's delays the greater part was ready by Christmas.

Hardly however was the ink of the manuscript dry, ere its indefatigable author was engaged in fresh labours. The biographical sketch, entitled, *Some passages of the Life and Death of...John...earl of Rochester*, was written in accordance with the dead man's desire. The cogency of this celebrated tract, which Dr Johnson so epigrammatically commends to "the critic for its elegance, the philoso-"pher for its arguments, and the saint for its piety" will be variously judged, according to the prepossessions of the reader; but its literary merits are beyond dispute. The essence of the book lies in the dialogues between Burnet and Rochester, which are rendered with singular felicity. The effective condensation of theological argument is Burnet's special aptitude; his earliest works had shewn dialectic skill; and the dialogue form gains here much in vivacity from the character of the protagonists. Even Charles II expressed his admiration, which was very generally shared. The work nevertheless aroused much

hostile criticism. Burnet was charged, absurdly enough, with violating, to his own glorification, the secrets of confession, and as absurdly blamed for venting, through the mouth of Rochester, "the monstrous principles of Spinoza."

Meanwhile the political situation was rapidly developing. Parliament, after seven prorogations, was summoned for October 17; and all parties rallied their forces for a grand final struggle. During the absence of Halifax, Shaftesbury and his "Exclusionists" had rapidly gained ground; and had convinced, cajoled, or terrified into acquiescence the majority of the "Country" party.

Among these new converts Burnet must now be reckoned. He was never indeed an enthusiast for the "Exclusion" issue. But Halifax away, Burnet had fallen under the influence of men who certainly belonged to that section.

William, Lord Russell, son and heir of Lord Bedford, held a unique position in the councils of the "Country" party. "His abilities" (to apply an epigram of Miss Edgeworth's) "were nothing extraordinary; his character was "first-rate." Though a rare and a reluctant speaker, sheer good sense, and simple force of character had carried him to the position of command; while his vast "stake in the "country" and his complete freedom from personal ambition, guaranteed his good faith.

Protestant zeal no doubt inspired Russell's "Exclu- "sionist" fervour. Arguments of expediency had probably turned the scale with Lord Essex, an administrator and diplomatist of some ability, who, during the preceding year, had acted with Halifax.

It was to these practical arguments that Burnet's conversion was due. The majority of the old "Country" party being now "violently set" on the "Exclusion," the offer of Limitations (so Burnet feared) must divide, and thus ruin the party.

Similar considerations, it was hoped, would secure Lord Halifax's adhesion; and the rumour that he stood his ground excited extreme irritation. Burnet did his utmost to prevent the threatened breach. "I got," he says, "many "meetings appointed between Lord Halifax and some "leading men...[but] without effect." Nor was personal

urgency wanting. "Both Tillotson and I," says Burnet, "who thought we had some interest in Lord Halifax, took "great pains on him to divert him from opposing...so "furiously as he did." It was of no avail. Haughtily ignoring threats which recalled his relationship to Strafford, Halifax "became as it were the champion against the "Exclusion." The great man's obstinacy exasperated Burnet's apprehensions; and the comments he inserts in his *History* are decidedly invidious. "The truth is," he says, "Lord Halifax's hatred of the Earl of Shaftesbury and "his vanity in desiring to have his own notion preferred, "sharpened him at that time to much indecency and fury."

The crisis soon came. By enormous majorities the Commons endorsed the popular policy. On the 5th of November ("snatching," it was said, the parchment from the table of the House of Commons) Lord Russell bore to the bar of the Lords a Bill of Exclusion. During the fierce debate which followed, Halifax rose supreme; and when, on the first reading, the Lords rejected the Bill, the furious majority in the Commons turned to rend its conqueror. To some, he seemed a Papist in disguise; to others, an Atheist.

Burnet meanwhile basked in the favour of the House. On December 22 was held a "solemn public fast that God "would prevent all popish plots, avert his judgments, and give "a blessing to the proceedings of Parliament." To Burnet fell the morning sermon, before the Commons, at St Margaret's. His text was the apocalyptic appeal to the Church of Sardis. Impressively he contrasts the long roll of national blessings with the tale of the national sins; and the awful cataclysms of the past enforce a call to national repentance. Nor does the preacher fail to urge upon the conscience of the Legislature its corporate responsibility. The suppression of vice, the increase of parochial endowments, the support of the Protestants abroad, are pressed upon his hearers. The command to hold fast the truth however evokes more invidious comments. The cruelty of Rome is pictured from his yet unpublished volume; her machinations are denounced; she has ever plotted and practised when unable to burn and destroy. Severities in religion are condemned, as contrary to humanity, and to rules reiterated in Scripture; but this

admirably tolerant exordium is marred by large reservations. *Religious* persecution Burnet indeed abhors; but he does not except against the *political* prosecution of creeds which trouble the peace. "If any sect of Religion continues to "breed frequent and almost uninterrupted disturbances in "any government [and] it is evident, as it is certainly in "this case, that their doctrine sets them on," such sect should (he submits) be *summarily banished the realm.*

This remarkable discourse drew from the House of Commons an extraordinary vote of thanks. In this the sermon was coupled with the first *Reformation* volume; and the House of Lords concurred in the second part of the vote. Dr Sprat, who preached in the afternoon, pleased the Commons less and the King better; he got no thanks from the one, but a good cure from the other; which (as Charles maintained) was worth considerably more.

Such being Burnet's popularity with the Commons, the friends of Halifax not unnaturally invoked his efforts on behalf of that unpopular peer. His stepfather "moved...," says Burnet, "I might be sent for to satisfy the House as "to the truth of his religion. I wish," he piously adds, "I could have said as much to have persuaded them that "he was a good Christian as that he was no Papist."

Another incident of the stormy session was the trial of Lord Stafford, the most important victim of the "Plot" imposture. Lloyd (by this time Bishop of St Asaphs) could have blasted the credit of a witness, but had feared a useless odium; and Burnet condoned this cowardice. Lord Halifax, on the other hand, had boldly voted for acquittal. The unhappy peer was condemned; and sending for Burnet and the Bishop of London, earnestly assured them of his innocence. At a second interview he revealed certain schemes for a general toleration, to which not only York but Shaftesbury had been privy. These revelations, which did not save the doomed man, brought upon Burnet (who seems to have acted with unwonted discretion) unmerited censure. He was accused of suggesting the charges; and while York, in consequence, conceived for him "an "implacable hatred," Shaftesbury, who looked on Burnet as the tool of Halifax, "railed" so unmercifully that Burnet approached him no more.

In fact, like the rest of the world, he was beginning to

view with disgust the despotic insolence displayed by the "Exclusion" party; and he seems to have swerved once more toward a less drastic solution. In talk with Littleton he had criticized the Halifax Limitations as too republican in tendency, and had suggested a Protectorate, or as Littleton rather called it, a Regency. This should vest, on a demise of the Crown, in the person of the Prince of Orange, husband of the Duke's daughter and heiress. "We dressed up a scheme of this," says Burnet, "for near "two hours; and I dreamt no more of it. But some "days after he told me the notion took with some and "that...Halifax...liked it." Towards the end of January, the insensate violence of the Commons almost compelled a dissolution; and Littleton then told Burnet, in strict confidence, that his plan took with the King. He urged Burnet to press the project among his allies; but Burnet made no headway. The friends of Monmouth were of course hostile; others were pledged to the Exclusion Bill; and the lawyers shrank, as such, from the constitutional complications involved.

The King however had resolved on a final effort. After a brief interval (during which the second *Reformation* volume actually appeared), a new Parliament met at Oxford on March 21. The Regency compromise, proposed by Littleton, was immediately rejected; the "Exclusionists" reintroduced their measure; and a week after its first meeting the King summarily dissolved his last Parliament.

The "Exclusion" party was thus completely checkmated, and the reaction began. "Popular heats," says Burnet, "have "their ebbings and flowings." The violence of the "Exclusionists" now recoiled on themselves; and Oates, whom they had championed, was involved in their general discredit.

Under these circumstances, Burnet's position was invidious. "I had been," he says, "much trusted by both "sides and that is a very dangerous state; for a man may "come upon that to be hated and suspected by both." The general drift of his previous action, and his continued intimacy with Russell and Essex, tended to identify him with the "Exclusionists," now derisively known as "Whigs"; and he incurred corresponding odium. "When such changes happen" (he wrote later on) "those who have been as to the main "with the side that is run down, will be charged with all

"the errors of their side, how much soever they may have "opposed them. I who had been always in distrust of the "witnesses, and dissatisfied with the whole method of pro- "ceedings, yet came to be fallen on, not only in pamphlets "and poems, but even in sermons, as if I had been an "incendiary, and a main stickler against the Court, and in "particular against the duke." The unpopularity which Burnet thus incurred among his clerical brethren (who had rallied almost unanimously to the Court, or "Tory" faction) accounts for the exaggerated spleen with which his Memoirs of two years later characterize the clergy. His diatribes, through an act of treachery, were long after surreptitiously published; and Burnet (to use an expressive colloquialism) "never heard the last" of these petulant sallies.

But Burnet was no thorough-paced "Whig." He repudiated, as we shall see, the *name*; and still rejected, as essentially immoral, the "Whig" approval of ultimate physical "resistance." Moreover, he was repudiated, with at least equal fervour, by extreme members of the party. For his clandestine correspondence with the Court was, as we have seen, an open secret; his betrayal of Grimston's confidence could not be forgotten. The Regency project he had favoured displeased the party; and his continued relations with Halifax increased "Whig" reserve. For Halifax, forced by "Whig" violence into alliance with the Court, enjoyed at this moment a precarious ascendency in its counsels. His statesmanlike advice galled the "Tories," flushed by their recent success; and he spared no effort to "rally" more moderate allies. He "pressed" Burnet "vehemently" (says the latter) to "accept of preferment at "Court; and said, if I would give him leave to make "promises in my name he would obtain for me any prefer- "ment I pleased. But I would enter into no engagements. "I was contented with the condition I was in, which was "above necessity, though below envy." Nor was he at all ambitious of parochial responsibilities. The dean and chapter of St Paul's had offered him an important city living, but he shrank from the charge; while on the other hand he very properly refused an excellent country benefice, which Essex would have given, on condition that he would *not* reside. He was less disinclined, however, to the

mastership of the Temple; preferring at this moment, as his Memoirs suggest, the continued companionship of lawyers to that of divines. The King, urged by Halifax and others, promised the reversion; and Halifax, says Burnet, "carried me" to the king. With him Burnet had never spoken since the episode of the admonitory letter eighteen months before. Halifax, says Burnet, "intro-"duced me with a very extraordinary compliment, that he "did not bring me to the king to put me in his good opinion, "so much as to put the king in [mine]; and added, he "hoped that the king would not only take me into his "favour, but into his heart. The king had a peculiar faculty, "of saying obliging things with a very good grace; among "other things, he said he knew that if I pleased I could "serve him very considerably; and that he desired no "service from me longer than he continued true to the "church and to the law. Lord Halifax upon that added "that the king knew he served him on the same terms.... "The discourse lasted half an hour, very hearty and free; "so I was in favour again. But I could not hold it. I was "told I kept ill company: the persons Lord Halifax named "to me were the Earl of Essex, Lord Russell, and Jones. "But I said I would upon no consideration give over con-"versing with my friends; and so I was where I was "before."

Burnet took the sensible line. "I went," he says, "into a "closer retirement; and to keep" (as he puts it) "my mind "from running after news and affairs," he resumed an early devotion to natural science and algebra. "I diverted "myself," he adds, "with many processes in chemistry."

A curious anecdote, preserved in Wodrow's *Analecta*, suggests that he also continued to take an interest in that strange society which represented the mystic side of mediæval "alchemy." For two years later he told a Scotchman, in Paris, that he had once gone in disguise to a Rosicrucian meeting. There he saw no one he knew; and yet the speaker began by mentioning that a spy was present who boasted of his great memory, and who "should hear their "great truths but should not be able to carry away one word." Burnet, piqued by this, composed himself to exact attention; but after a "charming" and (as Burnet believed) perfectly

intelligible discourse, he came away unable to remember a sentence. This he attributed to preternatural powers.

But he did not neglect more orthodox concerns. "I "hope," he says, "I went into the best exercises from which "I had been much diverted by the bustling of a great town "in so hot a time...I withdrew much from all conversation; "only I lived still in a particular confidence with the Lords "of Essex and Russell."

Scotch affairs however compelled his attention. On August 31 of this year passed the Act imposing a famous "Test Oath." This, originally introduced by the Opposition as a bulwark against Rome, was partially transmuted by the Court in its own favour. A tangle of inconsistencies resulted; offensive, though in different directions, to every party concerned. Moderate Episcopalians, however, of the school of Leighton and Nairne, were specially touched; and Charteris wrote to Burnet, begging him to impede, by every means in his power, the actual imposition of the Oath. Intervention was clearly vain; and Burnet (fearful lest a new schism should deprive the unhappy Church of Scotland of the members he regarded as her best) strained every nerve to allay the scruples of his friends. Upon Hamilton, who consulted him on the point, he urged the danger of refusal; and while pressing him to act as conscience should dictate, avowed a belief that the objections advanced to the Oath were excessively subtle. "I also," he says, "writ a paper...which was sent about "among my friends." The circular in question is now in the Bodleian Library, and defines, with absolute clearness, Burnet's contemporary attitude on the questions at issue.

He lays down two general axioms. I. "That we are "not so much to look at...secret...jealousies" [respecting the aim of given laws] "as at the declared designs...set forth in "their preambles." II. "That we ought always to pre-"sume in favours of Law, and that a moderation (you know "the Greek word for it) is to be used in softening the "words of laws, so as to make them agree with the general "scope of them, and to mitigate the harshness that may be "in them by the best interpretation that they can well "bear." In other words, his robust good sense deprecates pedantic scrupulosity.

In particular, he urges that the obligation to an obsolete Confession (—"a system of many opinions, of which some "are supposed to be doubtful and others false"—) can only imply adhesion to its main drift—can only connote the profession of the Calvinistic as opposed to the Lutheran theology.

But the Oath obliges to the defence of "all the King's "Rights, Jurisdictions, and Prerogatives"; including of course the Ecclesiastical Supremacy as "extraordinar[il]y "enlarge[d] or assert[ed]" by a recent Scotch Act. And why not? The oath merely compels one to acknowledge a *fact*. For it *is* true, that, by that law, the Legislature of Scotland has conferred on the King without reserve, and as Burnet maintains *without power of revocation*, "the "external government of the Church." This is now as exclusively his, as are "the Militia, Peace and War, the "Coin and several other great Prerogatives." The King, he allows, cannot "change the nature of things" or "take "away any of the rights that Christ or his apostles have "lodged with the Church." But he can if he please deny it "public encouragement" (*i.e.* in modern language, disestablish it); reduce it to the position it holds where "Heathenism or Mohammedanism are the legal Religions." If therefore "the King should employ his prerogative to "take away Episcopacy, this would not at all lessen the "obligation that such as believe it is of divine institution "are under of obeying their Bishop; it would [only] make "it costly or penal." Burnet, in fact, fixes his attention on a single point now very generally conceded; the political subordination of all corporations to the State. Most men now-a-days, whatever their prepossessions, suppose it competent to disestablish a church. Such fiat binds the subject, as does the sentence of a judicial tribunal; to which all must submit, though they think the verdict unjust.

What then as to the "great extent of the civil obedience" embraced within the Oath? By this "all sort "of resistance of any commissioned by the King, together "with all assemblies to consult of matters of State, civil or "ecclesiastical, are condemned and renounced; upon which "the Law of Self-preservation seems to lie heavy." Burnet answers, that the Supreme Authority in a State—

in Scotland, the King and the Estates combined—is *absolute* trustee of *the whole liberty and property of the nation*; and its Acts, if passed in free session, bind, unconditionally, "every single man" within the realm. This doctrine—with certain reservations—is held, to-day, by all save extremist minorities. We all obey laws (and most of us pay rates and taxes) of which at heart we disapprove. But if no appeal—save the desperate appeal of the sword—can lie *from* supreme authority—there is at least supposed to remain an appeal *to* it; the appeal from "Philip Drunk" to "Philip Sober." Burnet however seems to argue that a legislative decision, once given, may be given beyond legitimacy of recall. "As one man may sell himself and "become a slave...and [having] given away his liberty "cannot pretend to reassume it again," so Estates of Parliament can barter irrecoverably the liberties of the land they represent. The case, as Burnet maintains, has actually happened. "By making a law concerning the "militia and the use of the sword, by which they have "lodged those in the King or [have] declared that they "were formerly lodged in him" the Estates "have ended "the matter." It is useless to argue further the question of natural rights.

The denunciation of Ecclesiastical assemblies can, he says, but refer to "such tables, assemblies, and other "unlawful conventions that were the unhappy beginnings "of the late wars." It does not bar meetings "to carry "on the plain ends of the Christian Religion"; but only Assemblies, such as that of Glasgow in 1638, which attempt "to alter Laws and to inflame the nation against "the King"; and whose consultations "shake or at least "very much concern the State."

Finally, "the renouncing all obligation of any sort to "endeavour any change or alteration in the Government "either in Church or State...seems to contain a limitation "of all men's endeavours of amending...or perfecting...our "present Constitution. But...there are two senses, that "may belong to two terms in this branch of the Test...the "word *endeavour* [and]...the word *change or alteration*. "Endeavour may either be meant *Physically*, that is to go "about to work any change ourselves; or *Morally*, that is to

"persuade the King and the Parliament to make changes." *Physical* endeavours "are really acts of resistance and so "are unlawful things"; it is to them alone that the oath of renunciation could refer. In like manner the term "change "or alteration" cannot mean every "little variation" which in "a strict and metaphysical sense" may be called a "change"; but only "so great a reversing of present "establishments as may be called, in a political sense, a "change or alteration." Common sense, in fact, must decide.

These arguments may have influenced the synod of Aberdeen; but most of those whom he addressed, Charteris included, refused the oath, and resigned. Yet Burnet shewed no petty resentment; and though he had incurred some obloquy in Scotland by his recommendation of submission, he now drew upon himself the anger of the Court by his exertions for the sufferers. "About twenty" of the dispossessed clergy "came up," he says, "to England. I found "them men of excellent tempers, pious and learned; and I "esteemed it no small happiness that I had then so much "credit, by the ill opinion they had of me at Court, that by "this means I got most of them to be well settled in England." His correspondence with Sir Edward Harley, a leading "Whig," shews the energy of this generous interposition.

No less earnest was he on behalf of the Earl of Argyll, the Lord Lorn of his youth, long since married to Burnet's early friend, Lady Balcarres. The capital conviction of the Earl for taking the Test with reservations, aroused general horror, and stained the reputation of York. Burnet eagerly fanned Lord Halifax's just indignation; and tried to secure his co-operation with so unlikely an ally as the discarded Viceroy, Lauderdale. Burnet even projected a reconciliation between himself and his old enemy, now at death's door. He tells us that he refrained from a visit, on the advice of his friends, who warned him of the wrath which his proceedings had excited at head quarters; but that Lauderdale sent him some "very kind messages." Hickes (who had been Lauderdale's chaplain) represents Burnet as craving a pardon which Lauderdale, while declining intercourse, granted "as a Christian." Meanwhile, the indignation of York was intensified by a letter of well-merited rebuke addressed by Burnet to a member of Argyll's jury.

Under such circumstances even Burnet realised the necessity for circumspection. About January, 1682, while Argyll, having broken prison, was supposed to be lurking in London, Burnet, for reasons unknown, removed to the other side of Holborn. "Brook Buildings, raised out "of a large house and garden belonging to the Lord "Brooks," included Greville Street, which ran behind Furnivall's Inn, from Brook Street to Leather Lane. In Greville Street he settled; and it was there apparently, that in order to escape any general "obligation of returning "visits" he "built a laboratory; and for above a year... "ran through some courses of chemistry." This, adds Burnet, "helped me in my philosophical notions; was "a pleasant amusement to me, and furnished me with a "good excuse for staying much at home."

Whenever he could meanwhile he deprecated the Royal resentment. "I shall next tell you,' he wrote December 5, 1682, to the poetess Mrs Wharton, a cousin of Lord Rochester, "what an instance I have given of my resigna- "tion to the King's pleasure within these three days. "There were some sent to make me the proffer of a living "falling in London; which, though but worth £150, they "offered to make it to me £300; but I said, since the King "had expressed his displeasure at my having a place in "London, I would not do anything that might be thought "a contempt; and being pressed by them to write to the "Marquis of Halifax, to know if the King was still of the "same mind, I writ to him, and among other things told "him that, though my understanding was somewhat sullen, "and not so complaisant as to think of matters as my "interest might determine me, yet as to all my concerns, "none alive should pay a more undisputed obedience to the "King's pleasure than I should do; upon which I had the "enclosed answer which you shall burn as soon as you have "read it. I had likewise a message sent me" from the court "by the *new* Earl of Rochester (I hope this name "does not discompose you, as I confess it does me a little) "that I should have whatever I would lay my hand on in "the country if I would leave the town; but I sent him "word by the Earl of Arran, that brought the message, that "I would pretend to nothing, and desire nothing, but to be

"suffered to enjoy my retirement without disturbance or "jealousy."

Such neutrality however but exasperated the extreme Tories. "I do not know," he writes a month later to Mrs Wharton, "if you have heard of the new name about the "town, of *Trimmers*; with which, among many others much "better than I"—(we may instance Halifax)—"the high-"flying blades here have been pleased to dignify me. *I am "glad at least that they are so favourable as not to count me "a downright Whig.*" Yet, despite these attacks he declined to encourage hopes of further approximation to the Court. "As for your commending my obedience" (he wrote to Mrs Wharton) "and the effects you hope may follow upon it... "I have a great opinion of the decencies inferiors owe to "their superiors....But...I do not care to receive an obliga-"tion from some sorts of persons; for to a generous mind "no fetters pinch more than these favours do: and, since I "will preserve my liberty, I will not give any such a hold "on me as that would be, even to my thoughts."

Even Lord Halifax, while applauding his refusal, in vain deprecated his attitude of aloofness from the Court. "Though I was tender," writes the Marquis, "in advising "you to waive anything you might think advantageous for "you, yet since you have thought fit to do it, I am at liberty "to approve it. And I only desire you will not make too "hasty resolutions concerning yourself, and not be carried "so far by the sudden motions of a self-denying generosity, "as to shut the door against those advantages, which you "may expect with justice, and may receive without indecency. "Only a little patience is requisite and in the meantime no "greater restraint upon your behaviour and conversation "than every prudent man, under your character and circum-"stances, would choose voluntarily to impose on himself.... "Your withdrawing yourself from your old friends on this "corrupted side of the town...I can neither approve for my "own sake, nor for yours; for besides many other objections "such a total separation will make you by degrees *think less "equally, both of men and things, than you have hitherto "professed to do in what relates to the public.*"

The passage we have italicized is of course extremely important, coming from "the Trimmer" himself.

This flattering appeal, however, failed entirely of its effect. "I went," says Burnet, "no more near any that "belonged to the Court." Yet the overtures which had been made were repeated; in a letter of February 15, 1682–3 (written to his friend Mr Fall at Paris), he alludes once more to his rejection of proffered preferment, whereof a fresh instance had occurred the preceding week. "I "continue," he adds, "as I did, living much at home."

But Burnet, despite his reserve, could not altogether decline visits, which tended to increase. Among his remaining intimates we find his countryman, Mr Brisbane, Secretary of the Admiralty, a very accomplished man, and a decided Tory; while once at least, in the spring of 1683, Lord Halifax summoned him, and gave him, obviously for publication, details of a breach between his lordship and his "Tory" colleague, Lord Rochester.

Burnet's correspondence with Mrs Wharton, meanwhile, during the autumn and winter of 1682, possesses biographical interest. It probably originated with the *Life* of Rochester and in the fact that Mrs Wharton, under the pressure of personal trials, leaned like her cousin towards sceptical opinions. "I...earnestly desire...," wrote Burnet, "...to be... "instrumental in so glorious a conquest, as any officer would "mightily desire to take a Prince or a General prisoner." He refers her to Grotius and Wilkins; but she is not to rely solely on intellectual effort. "There is" (he characteristically proceeds) "an inward tasting of truth, which is very much "different from a sort of assent which is only extorted by "the force of argument....All the reasoning in the world "cannot persuade one that is sick to relish meat; a little "health, without any further dispute, does it effectually." To the retort, that the sick cannot give themselves health, he responds, they can put themselves in the way of it. Men can cultivate kindness, and a steady mood of composed reflection. Aided by prayer, and a resolute withdrawal from temptation, these are good preparatives for the search after truth. Religion, like all arts, demands a strict apprenticeship.

On Popery he is severe. It is but "a modest sort of "Atheism" in those whose understanding is awakened to a true sense of what God and religion must be; "for if

"religion is turned to a pageantry, it is only an engine for "children and fools—I will not add women."

As the correspondence proceeds, other topics intervene. The poetical effusions of his fair correspondent (which extorted Waller's praise) arouse Burnet's enthusiasm; but he makes bold to recommend the "labor limae." In return he forwards metrical compositions of his own; panegyrics on the lady, and a very complicated piece (in Cowley's worst vein), wherein the pure attraction Mrs Wharton exerts upon him is compared to magnetic force. He asks for criticism; but like most recruits to the ranks of the "genus irritable" is not quite pleased when he gets it. Burnet, in fact, despite his admiration for Ben Jonson, Milton, Beaumont and Fletcher, Tasso, and his dictum that no poetry but the best is bearable, proved a shockingly bad poetaster.

An ecstatic admiration tinges his relations with the lady; but censure is not spared. On an unfounded report that Mrs Wharton (the unhappy wife of a notorious libertine) contemplated a separation from her husband, his strictures are stern: "I look on all such things as both the wickedest "and the maddest things possible." Save where life is endangered, "which I am sure is not in your case," such a step "is a throwing off the cross [God] lays on us, and a preferring "our foolish inclinations and rash heats to his wise appoint-"ments; after which we have no reason to expect...his "protection....Self-interest...makes me...add one considera-"tion more; which is, that if ever you suffered those "impatient resolutions to prevail with you, I could never "after that allow myself the liberty of waiting on you."

But when reassured, his Platonic passion overflows. "For about eighteen years, I have made it a constant part "of my prayers that God would...put a speedy end to this "vain and foolish life....But now for some months I have "added a condition" that I would live "as long as I can "be of any use to you....This is the greatest compliment "I ever gave to mortal, vastly greater than to say I would "die for them, for, as I am made, that is none at all.... "I shall, while I live and when I die, carry with me a part "of a friendship for you, which...could be very little "believed by those who cannot understand what the force

"of that pure and elevated temper is, which, as it makes me "rejoice in your life and friendship above all the things of "this world, so makes me think of you as dying, or perhaps "dead, with that...serenity which shews that I love that "part of you that shall never die."

Elsewhere, alluding to a sharp attack of fever (which he ascribes, in part, to sympathy for her troubles), he reiterates his longing for death, and characteristically speculates on the possible effects of his "last words and "sense of religion" upon his correspondent's mind. In the postscript, however, our volatile friend is sufficiently mundane to express an ingenuous delight at a visit from Prince Borghese—"the greatest man in Rome next to the "Pope....As travellers do often hear of the slightest things "of the countries through which they pass so some unlucky "body told him somewhat of me; and yesterday he found "me out in my retirement...and finding that I love their "Italian books, he said he would presently write to Rome "for all that was curious in their language and present me "with it; and he having heard that I talked of going to "Rome some Long Vacation, offered me lodgings in his "palace, and the use of his coach and servants. It perhaps "raised his idea of me" (writes Burnet with childlike candour) "that while he was with me," Duke Hamilton came in.

Meanwhile, with the exception of the famous sketch of the devout Chief Justice Hale, for which materials were supplied by the pious care of a dependant, and which appeared early in 1682, Burnet's literary avocations centred round affairs in France. As to these he possessed peculiar sources of information. His friend Mr Fall, recently appointed historiographer for Scotland, was still domiciled in Paris; and they maintained an active correspondence on the surprising deadlock there reached. For that very Erastian monarch Louis XIV, while annihilating the franchises of the Huguenot sectaries, was at daggers drawn with the head of his own communion on the question of the "Regale" or alleged Royal right to the temporalities of vacant sees. Burnet was naturally drawn to a crisis which recalled so remarkably the genesis of the English Reformation; and in Hilary Term, 1681–2,

he published, with documentary appendices, a *History of the Rights of Princes in the disposing of ecclesiastical benefices and Church lands.*

In this work (which he afterwards supplemented) the Erastian Burnet of course decides for the King. His almost fulsome laudation of Louis XIV must however excite surprise. The reduction of French predominance in Europe, then at its height, was an opposition cry; and at Court Halifax resented, with patriotic bitterness, the insolent continental ascendancy of "le Roi Soleil." We can but suppose that Burnet, anticipating a French edition, hoped to further, by his effusive encouragement, the revolt from Rome; while exciting, through pathetic allusions, commiseration for Huguenot suffering. Such courtly panegyrics, however, were to be often thrown in his teeth during the anti-Gallican fever which marked his later years.

But if Burnet decidedly favoured the Royal pretensions he was just towards the King's opponents. The onus of the dispute is thrown on the incendiaries behind the King—the Jesuit order; the Pope and his Jansenist allies being treated with appreciative respect.

As usual, his inaccuracy of detail provoked the onslaught of precise scholars; while the Erastian tenets of the book, and its strictures on the clergy, involved him in a long polemic correspondence with the learned Comber, author of a defence of Tithes. It was eventually terminated by the good offices of Tillotson; and the only portion biographically interesting is a letter of Burnet's dated 14 March, 1682–3. This, while throwing the fullest light on his own ecclesiastical views, defends the purity of his motives. He repudiates, with natural indignation, "imputations of baseness or disingenuity, "or that [from a sense of resentment] I am endeavouring "to undermine a Church while I live in her communion.... "I...have [indeed] served in it these nine years without "getting one farthing of its revenue or advantages of any "sort." But it is not that he wants for patronage; "the "many great offers that have been made me both in this city "and in the country, of which some are very fresh," had been deliberately refused by him. As to anger: "I have "had not long ago an occasion public enough to show how

"little the resentments for a course of many years' injuries "wrought on me." His episcopal loyalty is untarnished. "In my preface to this last guilty book I assert the divine "right of episcopacy so positively that I have...given no "cause...to conclude I have changed my mind."—"And "why," adds Burnet, "you should think I envy the wealth "of the Clergy, or wish to see them stript of it, I cannot "imagine"; since on the most conspicuous occasions of his life he has pleaded for parochial endowments more adequate to their object.

On the other hand Burnet firmly repudiates Comber's teaching as to a "divine right" of tithes under the Christian dispensation.

"There are," he says, "some things which a very little "consideration discovers so plainly that all that can be said "against them can not change a man's thoughts concerning "them, so that whole volumes writ for transubstantiation "or absolute reprobation, though they were such that "I could not answer them, yet would never change my "opinion a jot." Among these topics he ranks the "divine right" of the clergy to a public tithe. Their legal right is of course another thing. And if we turn from theocratic and legal to *moral* obligation, neither Burnet's practice, nor his advice to others, are, he thanks God, bounded by a "single" or even a "double" tithing.

He declines moreover to retract the censures on the actual corruptions of the clergy, which had brought him, as they were to bring him in future, into clerical disrepute. The declension of the pastoral ideal is, he says, "the chief "prejudice under which good but weak minds labour, and "is the only sure ground on which all malicious enemies "to God and His Church can build. And when I see how "roundly many abuses are laid open and universally con-"demned in the Gallican Church which are so cherished "here by many, that if a man but names them he draws "a nest of wasps about his ears, I cannot but look on this "as a worse symptom of our condition than many others "that are more visible and affrighting. And in this matter "I am sure I have the best writers in many of the ages of "the Church on my side. When the Pastoral Care is so "universally neglected in its chief instances those that are

"truly concerned in the preservation and welfare of the "Church ought to be forgiven if this raises in them a deep "and just indignation even though that might on some "occasions carry them a little too far."

Nor will Burnet modify his view that the selection of Bishops and the assignment of the Bishops and parochial clergy to specific spheres of influence was originally in lay hands. "I cannot," he says, "comprehend how those who "pretend to justify this church in everything can condemn "[this] and assert the right to be in the clergy. Since it is "certain that the clergy does not elect in England and "that the popular elections continue. For as the popular "elections continued when they were contracted from the "rabble to the common councils in the cities so they still "continue being vested in the crown. The prerogative "being in things of that kind nothing but an aggregate of "the rights of the people centred in the crown; so that if "the people had not the right, the King has it not." This is practically the argument of Tindal's eighteenth century "Rights" shorn of its offensive implications; and foreshadows the "Low Church" controversies of Burnet's later life.

To the question at issue between the Huguenots and the "Most Christian King," he returned in a later production. The pressure applied to those of "the Religion," though still mainly of the moral order, was daily becoming more severe. Early in 1683 Burnet published, with able and very temperate comments, a translation of the "Letter writ by the...Assembly General of the Clergy "of France to the Protestants, inviting them to return "to their Communion." Concerning this tract he writes, in the letter to Fall, dated 15 February [1682–3] and already quoted, "As for the good reception of my book which "you set out as if you designed to try if it were possible "to swell me, I assure you all you say and all you expect "with relation to it has no other effect on me but to make "me bless God that assisted me to do that small service "to His truth, and I feel not so much as a tentation to "those thoughts which you so kindly guard me against, "and indeed the book I answered was so trifling and "pitifully weak that if it had not been for the greatness

"of the authority from whence it came I should not have "thought it worthy the little time I bestowed on it, which "was only the mornings of two weeks that I spent in "some visits in the country, before the rest of the company "where I was, met together; only I left blanks for those "places which were to be filled up with quotations. I shall "not be ill pleased to hear how Mr Claude" (the famous pastor) "is satisfied with it....Tell me if the French Ministers "do not think I am too cold in the justification of the Synod "of Dort." He inquires as to the propriety of presenting translations both of this work, and of the *Reformation*, to the leaders of French public opinion, social and religious; in preparation for a visit to Paris, which he was in hopes of paying in the course of some Long Vacation.

But we must now turn from these academic controversies to the public affairs, with which they were contemporaneous. For tragic events were looming, which Burnet little foreboded. And yet the political outlook of the winter 1682–3 was singularly inauspicious, not only to the "Whigs" and their allies, but to all men of statesman-like intuition. Despite the efforts of Halifax, the Court, or "Tory" interest (now predominant), had not shown modesty in triumph. The almost immediate arrest of Lord Shaftesbury, on a charge of high treason, had been only nullified by the "ignoramus" of a sympathetic grand jury; acting on which hint the "Court" party, by a series of skilful, if unscrupulous manœuvres, had secured during the year 1681–2 complete control over the jury system in the metropolis. Meanwhile the electoral body, in the great majority of urban constituencies, was being gradually reduced to complete dependence on the Court; and the franchises of that great "Whig" stronghold, the City of London, were seriously menaced. The prosecution of dissenters revived. "You may think what we are growing "to" (wrote Burnet to Fall, February 15, 1682–3) "when "I have been told that my preaching of gentleness to such "as differ from us in opinions...has been considered as a "favouring Nonconformists; and a message was sent me to "do so no more; but as long as I have a mouth to preach "the Gospel I will never be silent in that which I look on "as one of the main duties of it. Things are carrying very

"high both here and in Scotland; the tendencies of that "are very visible; but hot and fierce Churchmen will "neither grow wise nor moderate."

Warned by these sinister premonitions Shaftesbury, in November, 1682, had fled the country; greatly to the relief (as Lord Essex told Burnet) of his political associates. "Fear, anger, and disappointment had wrought much on "him...his notions were wild and impracticable...he had "done them already a great deal of mischief and would "have done more if he had stayed." In truth, as Burnet was to discover, Shaftesbury (who barely survived his voluntary exile) had been forcing on his reluctant associates the policy of immediate revolt.

In Scotland meanwhile, under the Government's heavy hand, the position of conscientious Presbyterians had become almost intolerable; and Burnet's brother, a physician, who had retained the principles of his mother, was compelled to take refuge in England. Plans were in the air for wholesale emigration to Carolina; and in April, 1683, several prominent Scots, including Burnet's cousin, Baillie of Jerviswood, came south on this pretext. Burnet, interested in the project, at once called on Baillie, and recommended discretion. After some weeks, however, Burnet's suspicions were aroused. His brother admitted that he had, while in Scotland, heard hints of "somewhat "in agitation"; and Burnet noticed with some dismay that his countrymen, while avoiding himself, were assiduous in intercourse with Russell. Mindful of the ruinous risings which had ushered in the reign of Queen Mary, he began to apprehend plans for disputing, on a demise of the crown, the Duke's succession. Essex had gone into the country; but Burnet hastened to wait on him and impart his fears.

Essex (in Burnet's language) "diverted" him from all his apprehensions. His lordship, indeed, having admitted that he considered "the obligation between Prince and "subject...so equally mutual, that upon a breach on the one "side the other was free," proceeded to stigmatise the aims and methods of the Government as already constitutive of such a breach. He seemed, however, to endorse, under the circumstances, Burnet's view as to the futility of revolt; and assured Burnet (as the latter tells us) "I might depend

"on it, Lord Russell would be in nothing without "acquainting" Essex.

By these assurances, Burnet's fears were lulled. It does not seem to have struck him that he was the last man in whom conspirators would confide. His "non-"resistance" principles were well-known; his character for loquacity was established; and he had carefully advertised his views on patriotic delation. "I had plainly told...my "opinion...that...I did not think it lawful to conceal any-"thing that might be told me of [unlawful] councils." As a matter of fact treasonable consultations had been recently resumed. At these Essex and Russell, Sydney and Monmouth, Howard the city leader, and others had been present; and though such consultations never passed the embryonic stage, and Russell's influence was from first to last entirely on the side of patience, Essex and Sydney at least were eager for speedy action.

Burnet, however, accepted Essex's disclaimer; and returned, with a mind at ease, to his literary labours, which had reached a very interesting period. He was now in his fortieth year; and to the spring of 1683 we assign the inception of the "Memoirs" or "Secret History," subsequently transformed into *The History of my own Time*.

The proximate motive is unknown; for the exordium and opening pages, as well as the portion treating of the years 1665–83, have unfortunately disappeared. Perhaps his fellow-countryman, Mr Brisbane, impressed by Burnet's fund of reminiscence, suggested the project, to which he was certainly privy. In any case Burnet seemed designed for a writer of Memoirs. A fluent pen, and a capacious memory, cannot be denied him; while from his youth up he had shown a keen interest in public matters, and dwelt in at least the outer courts of the political temple. We may compare him with the well-informed journalist of to-day, alert, intelligent, alive to every rumour of the lobbies and the clubs; admitted to the semi-confidence of responsible politicians. As a newsmonger, indeed, Burnet stands unrivalled. He combined, in the highest degree, that inappeasable thirst for information, and that complete absence of inconvenient delicacy, so characteristic of "our "special correspondent." It is even possible to regard him

as the father of the modern "interview." "Burnet" (says Cockburn) "was curious and inquisitive, and had...the "opportunity of conversing with all sorts of persons...from "the throne downwards. He never heard of any person "of note, whether at home or abroad, whom he did not "take some opportunity of visiting; and if they were not "of themselves ready to declare what they knew, he en- "deavoured to draw them into it by his curious questions." As a purveyor of anecdote, such a man is in his element; while the breadth of Burnet's interests, and the extent of his general information, were additional qualifications for the task he now essayed.

Events preceding the Restoration were probably summarized during the spring of 1683; and the work seems to have been in full swing, when a cloud, apparently insignificant, arose on the political horizon.

It was on June 12 that a tradesman named Keeling revealed a plot to raise the City and murder the King at "Rye House." It had originated in the Green Ribbon Club, the focus of Whig agitation in the City of London.

The trade of political perjurer had become so common that little attention was paid. Keeling however soon produced corroborative evidence; arrests were made in the City; and rumours of a "Protestant Plot" became widely current.

The anxiety of Burnet may be imagined; what he believed is less clear, though at this point his original memoirs become again available. Probably his opinion wavered in accordance with the reports. On June 21, for instance, "some [courtiers]," he says, "came to me and "assured me there was a reality in it....Mr Brisbane told "me the evidence was clear and undeniable."

Next day, however, Lord Howard called on Burnet. Though of disreputable antecedents, and known as politically extreme, he was yet externally plausible; and Burnet had already found him a difficult man to avoid. He inveighed against the malice of the Duke of York; and sneered at the evidence, as fit for a packed jury. But the tone of Burnet's court friends had left its impression; and he warned Howard that the charge, if justified, would ruin the Protestant cause. Howard hereupon, with the most solemn asseverations, disavowed all belief in the plot; and

Burnet, by consequence, "believed there was no truth in... "these discoveries."

Meanwhile Keeling and other "King's evidence" had flown at higher game; implicating, at second hand, in the more general scheme of a rising, the Duke of Monmouth and Lord Russell. Monmouth fled; Russell, who declined to do so, was committed (June 26) to the Tower. Others soon followed; Jerviswood and Essex among them.

These events threw into relief Russell's hold upon the party. For this modest gentleman, whose last thought was for himself, called forth the passionate devotion which more brilliant qualifications command. One gallant friend would have replaced Russell in prison, or cut him out from his guard at the very foot of the scaffold. Essex (not alone) refused to abscond, lest his flight should compromise Russell; Monmouth offered to "come in" and "run "fortunes" with his friend.

To Burnet the falsity of the charges against the English grandees seemed at first self-evident. "As soon as Russell "was put in the Tower" (he says) "I went to his lady, and "offered my service to her; for as I loved her lord much, "so I was particularly obliged by him." It was thus that Burnet first entered into direct relation with this noble woman, in whom "the vivacity of the French temper, and "the solidity of the English" had "produced a very rare "mixture." He shared the counsels of Russell's friends; and promised evidence to character for the forthcoming trial.

The innocence of the Scottish gentlemen, meanwhile, seemed to Burnet far more dubious. He sent, indeed, to the prison where his cousin Jerviswood lay, and assumed responsibility for all comforts supplied; "in which some," he says, "thought I was too bold." But he refused to "stand by" Baillie on his trial; alleging the professional decorum which he was about to waive for Russell.

The authors of the "Rye House" or "Murder" plot were duly tried and condemned. But for days the evidence against the "grandees" appeared extremely slender. Suddenly Howard was arrested; and at once turned traitor. It was under these circumstances that, on the 13th of July, "William Russell, commonly called Lord

"Russell," appeared at the bar of the Old Bailey; and that Burnet for the first time since the arrest, saw the face of his friend.

It was probably little changed. Fearless by temper and principle, Lord Russell faced with unaffected indifference an issue which to him seemed certain. His wife, with a courage yet greater than his own, sat by the bar, in the capacity of her husband's amanuensis.

The trial itself is more dramatic than the evidence; which last proved singularly meagre. It was sworn, indeed (on testimony technically insufficient), that Russell had attended treasonable consultations during the years 1682–3. But no witness could recall language expressive of treasonable consent. Upon this Burnet, in his Memoirs, strongly insists. A man, he argues, cannot be held accountable for all that passes in his presence; and he urges with considerable force his own notorious inadvertence. "I have "been often myself so engaged in the pursuit of one thought "that has been started, that for some time I have not "known what was said about me; though I have seemed "to make general answers of smiles and half words; and "silent men, such as Russell was, are more apt to run in to "such thoughtfulness." The plea in Russell's case is certainly just; and it was even supposed that matters tended to an acquittal, when a tragic episode sealed the prisoner's fate.

In his opening speech the Attorney-General had made ominous reference to Lord Essex. As Lord Howard, in the capacity of King's evidence, took his place in the witness box, a dread whisper crept into court, and reached even the witness. His effrontery was not altogether proof to the shame of his situation and the prisoner's undisguised contempt; and at this last awful touch he faltered where he stood. Lord Essex, an hour before, had committed suicide in the Tower.

All hope was at an end. In vain did Burnet, with others, attest Howard's tergiversation, and Russell's reiterated endorsement of constitutional methods; that one of the accused had "prevented the hand of justice" excited (even in Burnet himself) an instant irresistible presumption against the innocence of the other. Russell was found

guilty at four o'clock that evening; and on the following morning, with the same unbroken calm, received sentence of death, in the hideous formula of the time.

What effect had this sudden catastrophe on the mind of Burnet himself? One absolutely shattering; as is proved by the following very abject letter, directed, on the morning after Russell's sentence to Burnet's Court friend, Mr Brisbane.

"Dear Sir,

"I have writ the enclosed paper with as much "order as the confusion I am under can allow. I leave it "to you to shew it to my lord Halifax, or the King, as "you think fit; only I beg you will do it as soon as may "be, that in case my lord Russell sends for me, the King "may not be provoked against me by that. So, Dear Sir, "Adieu.

"Memorandum for Mr Brisbane,

"To let my Lord Privy Seal [Lord Halifax] "know that out of respect to him, I do not come to him. "That I looked on it as a great favour, that when so "many houses were searched, mine was not, in which "though nothing could have been found, yet it would have "marked me as a suspected person. That I never was in "my whole life under so terrible a surprise and so deep a "melancholy as the dismal things these last two or three "days has brought forth spreads over my mind; for God "knows I never so much as suspected any such thing; all "I feared was only some rising if the king should happen "to die; and that I only collected out of the obvious things "that everybody sees as well as I do, and to prevent that "took more pains than perhaps any man in England did, "in particular with my unfortunate friends, to let them see "that nothing brought in Popery so fast in Queen Mary's "days as the business of Lady Jane Grey, which gave it a "greater advance in the first month of that reign than "otherwise it is likely it would have made during her whole "life. So that I had not the least suspicion of this matter; "yet if my lord Russell calls for my attendance now, I

"cannot decline it, but shall do my duty with that fidelity "as if any Privy Councillor were to overhear all that shall "pass between us.

"I am upon this occasion positively resolved never to "have anything to do more with men of business, particularly "with any in opposition to the Court, but will divide the "rest of my life between my function and a very few friends, "and my laboratory; and upon this I pass my word and "faith to you, and that being given under my hand to you, "I do not doubt but you will make the like engagements "in my name to the king; and I hope my lord Privy Seal "will take occasion to do the like, for I think he will believe "me. I ask nor expect nothing but only to stand clear in "the king's thoughts. For preferment, I am resolved "against it though I could obtain it; but I beg not to be "more under hard thoughts; especially since in all this "discovery there has not been so much occasion to name "me as to give a rise for a search; and the friendship I had "with these two, and their confidence in me in all other "things, may shew that they knew I was not to be spoke "to in anything against my duty to the king. I do beg of "you that no discourse may be made of this, for it would "look like a sneaking for somewhat; and you in particular "know how far it is from my heart; therefore I need not "beg of you, nor of my lord Halifax, to judge aright of this "message; but if you can make the king think well of it, "and say nothing of it, it will be the greatest kindness you "can possibly do me. I would have done this sooner, but "it might have looked like fear or guilt; so I forebore "hitherto, but now I thought it fit to do it. I choose "rather to write it than say it, both that you might have it "under my hand, that you may see how sincere I am in it, "as also because I am now so overcharged with melancholy "that I can scarce endure any company, and for two nights "have not been able to sleep an hour. One thing you may, "as you think fit, tell the king, that though I am too in-"considerable to think I can ever serve him while I am "alive, yet I hope I shall be able to do it to some purpose "after I am dead; this you understand and I will do it "with zeal. So my dear friend, pity your poor melancholy "friend, who was never in his whole life under so deep an

"affliction; for I think I shall never enjoy myself after it; "and God knows death would be now very welcome to me.

"Do not come near me for some time, for I cannot bear "any company; only I go oft to my Lady Essex and weep "with her; and, indeed, the king's carriage to her" [in restoring her husband's estate] "has been so great and worthy "that it can never be too much admired; and I am sure, if "ever I live to finish what you know I am about, it and all "the other good things I can think of shall not want all the "light I can give them[1]. Adieu my dear friend and keep "this as a witness against me if ever I fail in the per-"formance of it. I am, you know, with all the zeal and "fidelity possible,

"Your most faithful and most humble servant,

"G. BURNET."

Sunday morning,
17*th* [15*th*] *July*, 1683.

This grovelling appeal (unearthed by Mark Napier near a century and a half later) is not one on which the candid biographer of Burnet can dwell with any complacency. Supplications such as these are unmanly, whatever the crisis; and there is something peculiarly repellent in the bribe which the historian offers to the Royal vanity. But we cannot, like Napier and other hostile critics, sever it from its immediate context; or read Burnet's whole career by the light of one distracted epistle. We can allow for the shock inflicted upon an excitable nature by the awful scenes of the week. He had seen one friend precipitate himself, by his own act, to what Burnet thought irrevocable perdition; another doomed to the fate which, above others, appals humanity—a public ignominious death. Nor were they to him, at this moment, the victims of unmerited persecution. Essex by his rash deed had convinced Burnet, that both were guilty of a crime of which he had previously absolved them; and of which the shame and penalty might recoil upon himself. The result was a moral collapse which recalls the collapse of Warriston.

But the mood was as transient as overwhelming. The summons so pusillanimously dreaded forthwith came; on

[1] This generosity is mentioned in the Memoirs, but not in the final *History*.

the following afternoon, within the walls of Newgate Gaol, Burnet stood face to face with Russell, in the condemned man's cell. An interview of some hours ensued.

Its effect upon Burnet was magical. The serene equanimity of Russell braced the quivering nerves of his friend; and Burnet eagerly accepted Lord Russell's asseverations, that he was morally guiltless of the charge for which he was about to die. As unhesitatingly he absorbed Lord Russell's belief that remorse on Russell's account had alone driven Essex to despair. Here Russell was wrong; for though Essex had certainly forced upon Russell the ill-omened comradeship of Howard, the complicity of Essex in schemes of revolt is clear.

Three days later Burnet wrote to Sir Edward Harley in a very altered strain.

"I hope you will forgive a very short letter now, for "my attendance on my lord Russell, as it takes up the "greatest part of my time, so it fills all my thoughts. I "shall only say this of him, that in my whole life I never "saw so much of the worthiness of a brave man, and of the "greatness of an excellent Christian met together, as are "in him. He will die clearing himself of all those crimes "for which he is condemned; except only the concealment "of some treasonable propositions which he opposed to "that degree that they were laid aside."

Lord Russell's self-exoneration moreover had excited in Burnet some hopes of inducing him to recant the formal doctrine of resistance. This might lead to a pardon; and must certainly exculpate Burnet in the eyes of the Court. Even after the first interview, self-deceived by his wishes, he had hurried to Tillotson, and assuring him "that he had "now brought my lord Russell to be sensible of the unlaw-"fulness of resistance...desired him" (adds Lord Halifax, our informant) "to acquaint me with it, that I might "tell it to the King, as that which might in some degree "soften him towards my lord....I took the first opportunity "of acquainting the king with it, and improved it the best "I could." Three days later, however, when Tillotson congratulated Russell on his change of opinion, "my lord "said that Dr Burnet was under a mistake, for that he had "only said that he was willing to be convinced....Upon this

"Dr Tillotson expostulateth with Dr Burnet for mis-
"informing him....Dr Burnet confesseth that he said it
"positively to Dr Tillotson, though my lord only...gave
"him hopes;...but he took it in the largest sense because
"he believed it might do him a good office to the king."
Tillotson felt the full awkwardness of the situation; and both he and Burnet (to quote the earlier and more ingenuous language of the latter) strove to convince Russell "of the unlawfulness of taking arms against the King," not only "in the condition we were then in" but "*in any case.*"

Russell however was not shaken. Never a ready speaker, he was preparing, in place of the usual "dying speech," a paper for publication. He had consulted Burnet on the order of topics; and had even adopted his suggestion of clearing the "Country" leaders from the charge of suborning Oates. He also, on Burnet's urgency, deleted "with a smile" some lines on the dangers of *slavery* which Burnet thought ill-timed. Finally, on the day before that on which he was to suffer, he shewed the divines a passage which he proposed to insert for their justification.

This reiterated his own opinion "that a free nation like
"this might defend their religion and liberties when in-
"vaded...though under...colour of law"; but admitted that
"some...eminent divines...whom I...esteem to a very great
"degree" had offered weighty reasons for regarding "faith
"and patience" as the only "proper ways for the preserva-
"tion of religion."

Tillotson thought this so insufficient, that he renewed the charge, in a paper which he submitted to Russell the same afternoon. Therein he argued that the resistance of constituted authority is contrary to social morality; and is offensive alike to the Christian creed in general and the Protestant faith in particular—to the laws which establish the Church in England, and to the recent Militia Act. Tillotson describes Russell's position as a "great and "dangerous mistake"; imperilling his "eternal happiness" and necessitating a special and public repentance.

Russell, after receiving the paper, retired to consider it. On his return, he confessed himself unconvinced, but hoped God would pardon him, if in error. Tillotson then urged Burnet to a final effort; failing which, the paragraph should

be suppressed as worse than useless. Burnet's endeavours failed; and the passage was accordingly cancelled.

Meanwhile that same day Burnet addressed to Russell two discourses, which were published for the first time thirty years later. The first (on divine assistance in the hour of death) is not remarkable. But the second, on the Beatific Vision, contains passages of great beauty, in which the issues of birth and death, with their attendant pangs, are forcibly compared; and the spiritual splendours of a diviner life are finely imagined.

That night took place the silent parting between Russell and his wife, which Burnet, with artless pathos, has rendered immortal. The following morning, on a scaffold raised in Lincoln's Inn Fields, Lord Russell, with unflinching composure, knelt at the block. Burnet and Tillotson saw the tragedy to its close; and Burnet received Lord Russell's last message for his wife and father.

Within an hour, by Lady Russell's efforts, copies of her husband's paper were selling in the streets. It created intense excitement; and many ascribed it to Burnet's ready pen. Meanwhile Burnet himself was recording for Lady Russell's benefit a journal of the preceding five days. In these few pages, written under the immediate stress of ennobling emotion, Burnet, for the only time in his life, attains to narrative beauty. Homely, almost bald in their pathetic simplicity, they paint, with a touch as of genius, the man they portray. The quiet English gentleman, raised above himself by the crisis so unswervingly faced, and tranquil in the conviction that his death must "serve "his country," rises before us almost as vividly as the Socrates of the *Phædo*.

While Burnet, on the following day, finished this journal, he and Tillotson were called before the Council to be examined upon Russell's paper. Tillotson's interrogation was short; for in his own exculpation, he had already laid before Halifax his admonitory letter to Russell. This was promptly published by the authorities; and proved, long afterwards, a thorn in the flesh to both divines.

Burnet, however, was questioned at length. To prove Russell's preoccupation with the composition of the disputed paper, Burnet offered to read the "journal" which

he had just completed. "I saw," says Burnet, "they were "all astonished at the many extraordinary things in it." The Duke of York, whose animus against Russell was personal, resented this perusal of a "studied panegyric" on the dead; the king sat silent. A few more questions and Burnet was released from the presence, which he never again entered. For Burnet's strangely rapid change of attitude had disgusted the King, who definitely set him down as the author of the speech and as an unprincipled jack-of-both-sides. An order was sent to the Rector of St Clements Danes, who in consequence "discharged" Burnet of the lectureship; efforts were made to bring Russell's paper, and its supposed author, within the dreaded scope of the Scotch law against "leasing"; and the King, as Burnet tells us, "said once" to Duke Hamilton's heir "he believed I would be content to be hanged to "have the pleasure to make a speech on the scaffold; but "he would order drums" to be beat "so that I should not "be heard." Considering the charge under which he laboured, Burnet's retort, "when it came to that" he "should put" his "speech in such hands that the world "should see it if they could not hear it" was not very happily imagined.

Yet more suspicious, in the eyes of the Court, would have seemed the handsome honorarium presented by the Russell family. It amounted to 150 guineas, which appeared to Burnet providential; since it exactly enabled him to wipe out a debt contracted for a kinsman, who had failed in business.

Halifax meanwhile did not desert Burnet. He persuaded him against publishing a self-exculpation, which is still extant for the curious; and Burnet therefore contented himself with submitting it to his ecclesiastical superior the Bishop of London. The continued patronage of the Minister remained no secret; and Dr Hickes (who had been, as we know, Lauderdale's chaplain) ascribed to the influence of Burnet and Tillotson the repugnance shewn by Halifax for his own promotion. "Hinc" (in after years) "multæ lacrymæ."

Meanwhile the whole episode left profound traces on Burnet. He had acted throughout in a spirit of loyalty to the Court, and he naturally resented the injustice with

which his action had been repaid. Nor was it in human nature—especially such impressionable human nature—to escape entirely the contagion of principles so steadily maintained, under circumstances so awful, by so admired a friend. But the effects, if lasting, were slow in operation.

For Burnet remained still staunch to his "passive "obedience" doctrines. A month after Russell's execution he inserted in his rapidly progressing Memoirs an elaborate excursus. This recapitulates and revises the "non-resist- "ance" argument of his early *Vindication*, and his paper on the Scottish Test. His conclusions are unchanged. "If," he says, "I had not seen too much of the injustice and "baseness of the world to wonder at anything, I should "wonder much to find myself aspersed as a favourer of "rebellion; whereas I think there is no man living whose "principles determine him more steadily against it." Yet the tone shews a marked alteration; he is convinced but no longer enthusiastic. "If I am able to search anything "to the bottom, I have done it in this matter; and indeed, "my aversion to the ill conduct of affairs, and somewhat of "natural heat and carelessness in my temper *has given me* "*the bias rather in favour of resistance than against it;* "*so that nothing but the force of reason and conscience has* "*determined me.*"

Meanwhile certain passages of the Brisbane letter attract us to the character of Charles II, which occurs in this part of the Memoirs. This sketch is vivid enough, and conspicuously just; but the exordium has a sinister sound. "[The] character of the King and duke...*I must* "*give...at present very imperfect*, otherwise what I write may "happen to be seized on, and I know not what may be made "of that; *but I will venture on a good deal now, and if ever* "*I outlive them I will say the rest then, when it will be more* "*safe.*" This is an unpleasant variant on the promises of the Brisbane letter. But our disgust deepens—perhaps to an exaggerated degree—when we turn to the posthumous portrait, which will be discussed later on.

Meanwhile, as Burnet had foreboded, the "Protestant "Plot" had completed the discomfiture of the "Whigs." Burnet himself, as Russell's supposed abettor, was a target for the Tory press; and he thought it the moment to effect a long-standing project. "I cannot," he wrote to

Sir Edward Harley, on August 18, "write any long letter "being to go...for a few weeks over into France (having "obtained a pass for it)....I intend to come back, if it "please God, by the beginning of the Michaelmas term, "and then I shall give you a more particular account of "the state of the Protestants of France."

After an evening spent with Lady Russell, he left London on Monday, August 20, and seems to have reached Paris before the end of the month. His welcome was flattering in the extreme; and this on several accounts. To the Protestants he was recommended by his controversial services; to the Court by the history of the Regale. The contests with the Papal See moreover had become so acute, that even Papists read eagerly in the pages of Burnet's *Reformation* of the rupture between England and Rome. In addition Lady Russell, by birth half French, was niece to the Marquis de Ruvigny. A leader in Protestant circles, his diplomatic services still maintained his credit at Court; "and he," says Burnet, "studied to have "me...visited and known."

Years later a Scotchman, who had been at this time in Paris, gave Wodrow some curious particulars of Burnet's reception. Summoned to the Royal Presence he met, it was said, the Royal Party returning to Versailles; the King descended to give audience, and took Burnet into his coach. A man of learning and politeness was appointed his cicerone; and was horrified to find that though he "spoke the French tongue very ill...his "confidence and assurance bore him fully out, and he "talked for ever and as much before the King as in his "own room." The distressed courtier remonstrated; but "Burnet did not amend, and the King bore all."

The attentions thus lavished on a disgraced man exasperated the English Envoy; but Louis, at the apogee of his splendour and his insolence, flouted the displeasure of Charles. "Dr Burnet" writes our representative bitterly enough to Halifax "is already as busy and as well "acquainted here as in England....I met him at Fontaine-"bleau, where he had been some days....I was surprised... "to see him...within two or three persons of [the King].... "Upon Thursday and Friday last [he] went to Versailles,

"as I believe by invitation, where he had the greatest "reception imaginable; the King took very great notice of "him; he was presented to the dauphin, caressed by people "of quality of both sexes...." The waters played for him; one of the dauphin's coaches was placed at his disposal; and all the "appartements and cabinets were open to him." Louis himself had emphasized the fact that no more had been done for Prince Borghese; and never a minister of the English King's (adds the aggrieved diplomatist) had enjoyed such a reception. The Envoy, who was obsessed by fear of intrigues between the French Court and English discontent, urged the political aspect of the episode; though it seems to have struck even him that some of this effusive civility was for the eyes of the Papal nuncio.

The Envoy's complaints were not, of course, very happily directed, and Lord Halifax blandly ignored them. The Secretary of State, however, the supple Sunderland, duly expressed his master's astonishment. Burnet, since the Envoy would not countenance him, declined the formal audience offered by Louis; but he still mingled freely with both courtiers and churchmen. Some of them impressed him very favourably, and they showed themselves in general as concerned for his spiritual welfare, as at one with his Erastian policy. Even the gentle La Vallière from her austere retirement was induced to summon Burnet to the grate of her Convent parlour, and recount the steps of her "conversion." With the heads of the Protestant community he was of course on intimate terms; and as inevitably shared their alarm at the increasing violation of their rights.

About October $\frac{18}{28}$, he left for England, and spending a few days at Rouen, must have reached London in November. The pamphleteers had been busy at the expense of his private no less than of his public character, and had been answered, if not by himself, yet by friends writing in his name. He found the Court moreover highly offended at his French success; and the irritation was probably increased when (on his trial in December) Algernon Sydney summoned Burnet as a witness to Howard's character. These events tended more and more to asso-

ciate him with the "Whig" element. "Many from the "Court," writes Burnet, "came oft to see me, and they "all studied to possess me with the apprehensions of the "severities that were designed against me. I made one "answer to all, that I never troubled myself with the fear "of what false witnesses might swear against me for that "was without all bounds, and I was very sure no body could "with truth lay anything to my charge; so I continued "not only in quiet, but with that natural cheerfulness that "arose from a good constitution and a clear conscience."

Indeed, during the winter, he rendered the Court some incidental service. On the precarious evidence of two children a Whig fanatic proclaimed that Essex had been murdered in the Tower. Burnet (characteristically the first to inform Lady Essex of the rumours) undertook to sift them; and was soon able to discount them entirely. He thus drew on both the wrath of the extreme Whigs; who, as he admitted at the time, saw political capital in the story.

Burnet meanwhile renewed his periodic resolve to withdraw, for a time at least, "from the conversation "and table of the world." His books were not available; they seem for some reason to have been transferred, in packing cases, to Lady Russell's care. But he ruminated upon literary projects, involving no original research. "I "writ then" (he says) "a large book concerning the truth "of religion and the authority of the...scripture, with all "the freedom of one that was disengaged from parties "and interest." Mystery surrounds this work, which was designed for posthumous publication. In his autobiography, 27 years later, Burnet records, "I have lately read [it] "over, and am of the same opinion I was then as to the "main of it. In some particulars I have seen farther than "I did then." A codicil to his will directs that the volume shall be published. But it never appeared, and the manuscript is not forthcoming.

Burnet also, having (as he puts it) "much leisure" and wanting "diversion," executed an anonymous translation of More's *Utopia*. The preface contains an enthusiastic tribute to More; and hints that the more revolutionary portions of the work cannot embody his personal convictions.

It also includes some of the few purely literary dicta which Burnet has left. Bacon, though a little ornate for contemporary taste, is still "our best author." Shakespeare Burnet ignores; but Mulgrave's *Essay on Poetry* (which praises him) is truly Augustan; and the dramatists of the last age—Ben Jonson, Beaumont, and Fletcher—overtop their successors, whose transports the *Rehearsal* has curbed.

A better-known essay is Burnet's *Life of Bedell*, the saintly Bishop of Kilmore. Its history is somewhat obscure. About 1675 (at the instigation of his patrons, the Harleys) Bedell's son-in-law, Clogie, Vicar of Wigmore, had written an account of the Bishop. He seems to have been dissatisfied with the result, and four years later, hearing that Archbishop Sancroft was to edit Bedell's works, had offered the Primate his materials. Did he meet with a rebuff? Possibly, for by 1682 we find Sancroft in correspondence with Bedell's sons; while Clogie had submitted his own sketch to Burnet. He for some years declined the project; being, as he says, apprehensive lest some "might take exceptions to my writing on "that argument." He subsequently represented himself as overcome by Clogie's importunity, but this was a slip of memory; the renewed overture certainly emanated from himself.

On November 20, 1683, we find Burnet writing to Clogie's friend, Harley. "I remember you told me you "had a copy of Mr Clogie's life of Bishop Bedell, and "in the leisure that my retirement is like to procure me "this winter, I intend to look over that and see what "I can make of it, so if you will do me the favour to let "me have the sight of that book a few weeks I shall "certainly return it to you again, and shall send you with "it the form in which I will cast it that it may be communi-"cated to the author." Burnet's first draft was ready by January 22, 1684; and anticipating the completion of the fair copy, he fears Clogie may consider Burnet has "stripped it too much of the ornaments with which" Clogie had "clothed it." On April 3 Burnet suspects that a delay in the return of the manuscript (dispatched six weeks earlier) may foreshadow Clogie's discontent; "If this is the truth, pray tell him that he may be very

"free with me, for I will not take it amiss from him "nor will I stir one step but with his approbation."

These extracts justify Burnet's subsequent contention, that he was merely answerable for the form of this anonymous biography and not for its contents. Unfortunately however Mr Clogie, though earnest and exemplary, had little historical apparatus. His manuscript teemed with blunders, which Burnet's own knowledge should have enabled him to detect; but which, at a distance from his books, he reproduced with uncritical fidelity. The work therefore, though agreeably written, and frequently reprinted, cannot rank with successful biographies; and excited an even unusual amount of the "odium "scholasticum."

The preface includes a tribute to the exemplary prelates of all the ages. Scougal, who had just died, ranks among Scotch examples; and we suspect a covert exculpatory allusion to the episode of 1666. Another name, suppressed in the original lest a sensitive modesty should suffer, was replaced marginally, when such motives lost their force. While the work was in the press, Leighton died.

From his Sussex retirement he had maintained with Burnet a kindly familiar correspondence. His alienation from Rome had increased; his growing sense of the practical abuses undermining the Church of his adoption and which he regarded as essentially the best, fired Burnet's zeal for reform. In the summer of 1684, at Burnet's request, Leighton came to town on an errand of pious reproof. All admired the vitality of a man who had passed his seventieth year; but to Burnet's compliments Leighton made response, that the end was at hand. Within twelve hours he experienced a chill; but assisted by Mr Fall, then in London, acquitted himself of his errand. Next day he sank into a lethargy; and on June 28, 1684, in the presence of Burnet and at the Bell Inn, Warwick Lane, he peacefully expired.

Few episodes are more touching than the passionate devotion paid by Burnet to the memory of Leighton. Appreciating as he did intercourse with the persons of the world-drama—familiar as he was with the salient men of the day—one lowly figure despised in life, almost ignored in

death, retained his supreme reverence. And as he strode, a bespattered pilgrim, through the miry ways of this sublunary world, there hovered ever before him—fervently serene—humanely austere—remote, yet benign—the saintly image which had captivated his youth—the "Apostolic," the "Angelical" Leighton.

Meanwhile, ere his Bedell had left the press, Burnet secured a copy of Bedell's controversy with Waddesworth the papist, then long out of print. He advised the publisher, who on this occasion was one "John Southby," (apparently an *alias* of Chiswell), to reprint it, with the *Life*; but noticed, when the work was in proof, a vigorous justification of wars of religion undertaken in self-defence. As the onus of an anonymous publication must fall on the publisher, who had recently incurred odium by printing Whig books, Burnet showed him the passage; and the printer submitted it to Sir Roger l'Estrange, a rabid "Tory," then licenser of the press. L'Estrange insisted that two pages should be reprinted; that a note by himself, contravening the argument of the text, should be marginally inserted; and that the text itself should be deliberately garbled so as to transform a categorical into an hypothetical argument. Burnet (though opposed to Bedell's view) could not but resent so flagrant a falsification. He insisted on bracketing the insertions; and washed his hands of the matter.

When the book appeared is not clear, though Burnet himself suggests that it came out early in 1685. Its authorship was not at first known, and Sancroft suspected his amanuensis. The surplus copies however reappeared after the Revolution, with Chiswell's imprint and Burnet's name on the title page, and a clumsy printer's recension of the two garbled pages. The forgery attracted expert attention; and Burnet was of course charged with editorial dishonesty, a charge which he triumphantly refuted.

Meanwhile "I continued," says Burnet, "still at the "Rolls, avoiding very cautiously everything that related to "the public; for I abhorred," he adds—the statement sounds strange in the light of his subsequent practice—"the "making the pulpit a stage for venting of passion or for the "serving of interests." Another parish fell vacant, of which the people were patrons; "and it was probable it would

"have fallen on me; though London was in so divided a "state, that everything was managed by the strength of "parties. Yet the king, apprehending the choice might "have fallen on me, sent a message...[that] he would take "it amiss." Burnet redoubled his caution. As the fifth of November approached he deprecated the usual sermon; lest by the topics proper to the day he should incense yet further the Duke. The Master however insisted; and Burnet, who, for a year, had never touched on Romanism, delivered a Phillipic against Popish cruelty. It was qualified by arguments on behalf of exemplary papists, and by an eulogy of passive obedience. Unluckily however the text was that which appeals from the rage of the Lion and Unicorn; and this was interpreted as an oblique allusion to the supporters of the Royal arms. Burnet moreover rashly referred to a reported imprecation of James I against descendants who should revert to Rome. The Court was enraged; and Burnet, in his own defence, printed the sermon. The Master of the Rolls nevertheless at the end of term, received orders to dismiss Burnet, as a person disaffected, from a chapel which the King chose to number with his own. Sir Harbottle perforce yielded; and Burnet's sermon of November 16 proved his last as preacher at the Rolls. He lost however little. "It has pleased God," he wrote to Harley on January 10, "so to order it by his "providence, that the employment in which I was is fallen "by the good old man's death, so that if I had been let "alone I must have been by this time in the same state "in which I am. I hope I shall be a gainer by my silence, "and I do not think that any other person can lose much "by it. To be forced to retire into one's own mind and to "examine all that one has said as well as the principles and "motives from which it has proceeded, may prove both a "blessing to oneself and in due time (that is in God's time) "may be of some advantage to others." In the same letter the dispossessed preacher touchingly exerts himself in the interest of other men; notably those still unsettled among the Scottish "Test" nonjurors.

Meanwhile the disgraced divine retained the favour, if not the confidence of Halifax; who about December secretly distributed, as a "ballon d'essai" his famous anonymous

tract on *The Character of a Trimmer*. For the Minister had at length defied the extreme Tories; and hoped to oust them and their patron the Heir Apparent from the Royal favour. He and Burnet discussed with special earnestness rumours, current that winter, as to the King's leanings towards Rome. These, as is well known, were strikingly verified, when in February, after a few days illness, Charles II suddenly died. "The great change that has been here," wrote Burnet, a week later to Harley, has "driven almost "all other thoughts out of my mind." The melancholy reflections excited by "so great a turn of divine providence "...are (he opines) fitter exercises for a closet than for a "letter." Characteristically however he managed after the autopsy, to interview the Royal physicians; and learned from them the folly of those rumours as to poison, which he himself, on dubious evidence, subsequently endorsed.

And what of the posthumous character of the King which Burnet, some eighteen months later, added to his Memoirs? It is this which draws the notorious parallel with Tiberius, of which Fox said that no one but the author has ever seen the force of it; and advances the monstrous charge of incestuous passion. The glaring and progressive contrast between this portrait—the likeness of 1683—and the terms of the Brisbane letter—suggests a sinister interpretation; Burnet, it may be urged, deliberately libelled the Monarch who had repelled his advances. Such a view, however, would be grossly unjust. Burnet's judgement no doubt was often warped by his passions; and he had been greatly wronged. But, apart from this, the closing months of the reign had been darkened by the complete and illegal evasion of Parliamentary control; and by a severity, in some instances indistinguishable from tyranny, which assumed even exaggerated proportions in the eyes of those into whose arms the Court had now thrust Burnet. Moreover, the knowledge that the Head of his Church had been a secret apostate to her rival caused in Burnet's own breast an overwhelming revulsion. Such sacrilegious hypocrisy, he thought, showed a conscience capable of any and every crime.

CHAPTER VI.

IN EXILE 1685–8; REIGN OF JAMES THE SECOND.

The demise of the Crown, long awaited by all parties with acute apprehension, had passed off without disorder. The "Tory" wave had by no means subsided; Monmouth was in exile; and the new King's promise "to maintain "the government in Church and State *as established by* "*law*," occasioned general satisfaction. But to Burnet the terms of the Royal pledge appeared curiously ominous. He knew from the King's own lips that he "looked on "Queen Elizabeth as a usurper that had no more authority "than Oliver Cromwell"; and he was not therefore re-assured by the appeal to *legality*. But he held his peace. He had learned some respect for words uttered in confidence; and moreover, as he says, "though I had "spoken of it, it would not have signified much; for all "people took up this for a maxim, that they must trust "the King."

Only the most ecstatic loyalty, however, was welcomed at Court. Halifax, on February 8, had a private audience of James, in which the King, though civil, foreshadowed his disgrace. When therefore he desired leave, as Burnet tells us, "to present me to the King, that I might kiss his "hand, which all people did, the King not only refused it, "but spake sharply of me." Upon this, having no employ-ment which could detain him in England, "I desired Halifax "to ask the King's leave for me [to go abroad]; which "the King said he [granted] with all his heart." On February 12 Burnet wrote to Sir Edward Harley: "I "think to go for some time beyond seas within a few "weeks." But as he adds elsewhere, "I could not execute

"this as soon as I intended." His imbecile wife was "languishing and likely to die every day." He therefore remained in England three months; a period for him of grave apprehension.

The tide of public feeling and the recent manipulation of the urban franchise seemed prophetic of a Parliament loyal to the point of servility. This forecast, with the King's peremptory collection of customs unsecured by law, gave pause to thoughtful men. Halifax shewed extreme depression. He told Burnet, as the latter puts it, that only two things "could save us." The King's supposed desire for a spirited foreign policy must render him dependent on parliamentary supply; and the initial session, curtailed by the exigencies of harvest, might work off innocuously the exuberant loyalty of the members.

Among the Whig extremists meanwhile counsels of despair prevailed; and the violence of their discontent "made some hot men in London...fancy it might be a fit "time now for the [exiled] Duke of Monmouth to raise "a rebellion."

To such men, Burnet's "Whig" associations, and the rebuff so recently received naturally commended him; and his position became extremely embarrassing. "I knew," he says, that men of this stamp "...were often shut up in "little cabals. Some of them came to see me, and talked "in general of what might be expected from this Parlia- "ment...but...I would have nothing to do with them...for "I knew that all the men that were for the Duke of "Monmouth were factious and wicked people....I was "afraid that they would have insinuated themselves into "my Lady Russell," who could have provided the sinews of war. He remonstrated with her, and on his advice, she declined intercourse with the extremists; "this...was "imputed to me, and I was severely railed at for it." With all over whom he thought he had influence, he deprecated a resort to violence; though his subsequent explanation that he "did not *yet* think the King had done "enough to justify any such extreme counsels" no doubt unconsciously adumbrates the later attitude of our still non-resistant divine. The argument of expediency, however, is always the most cogent, where principles differ; and

Burnet urged upon the "resistance" party that "a raw "rebellion would be either presently crushed, and so raise "the power of the court, and give...colour for...a standing "army"; or else it must occasion lasting civil wars, the intervention of the French—and perhaps a commonwealth. His arguments fell flat; though no one, he says, thought the rising so imminent as it proved.

When the Session drew near, however, Burnet's nervousness increased. He sought and obtained from Lady Margaret's Scotch relations their concurrence in a scheme for entrusting her to "some in whom they "had great confidence." Alarming events precipitated his departure. Late on the evening of the tenth of May Duke Hamilton's son called on Burnet, possibly upon business connected with Lady Margaret's affairs. The King, he told him, had just received news that the Earl of Argyll—Burnet's old friend and Monmouth's fellow-exile—had sailed a week earlier in hostile fashion for Scotland. "I "saw," says Burnet, "it was time for me to be gone, "since if risings were once begun I had all reason to expect "that I should be used as a suspected person." He made his will; and, within twenty-four hours, sailed for France. Ere he had reached the French capital, his wife died.

As a place of refuge, France had obvious advantages. It was necessary for Burnet to avoid the "Whig" exiles in Holland; where, moreover, the Prince of Orange, then straining every nerve to conciliate his father-in-law, could hardly have regarded Burnet as a *persona grata*. And further, Burnet had ascertained, through the French Ambassador in England, that James II would approve a sojourn in France if Burnet remained in retirement. Burnet had also extracted from the Ambassador a promise of due warning, should the King at any future time demand his extradition.

In Paris, "that I might be quiet and less suspected, I" (says Burnet) "took a house," and for two months "lived "by myself." Nor did he "think it expedient to converse "with any but men of learning." As usual he seized every chance of securing historical memoranda, but his informants at this juncture were not particularly reliable. Lord Montague (Lady Russell's brother-in-law), then in voluntary

exile, may claim to rank as the most accomplished liar of a not very scrupulous day; while in "Colonel" Stouppe, a former spy of Cromwell, we detect the mere subaltern intriguer, concerned to magnify the import of his own petty machinations.

Gossip seems to have been very rife concerning the King and Madame de Maintenon, whose marriage was generally credited. "It seems," adds Burnet, "they design "to have the King's life writ in all languages; for a creature "of the Archbishop's of Paris came to me, and told me "if I would undertake to write the King's history in "English I might have what reward I pleased." But times had changed, and with them the sentiments of the author of the *Regale*. It was then but three months before the revocation of "The Edict." The solvents of bribery, intrigue, and persuasion which had been applied to Huguenot firmness, and to the last of which Burnet three years earlier had retorted, were now subordinated to the stern polemics of the "dragonnades." So Burnet, as he tells us, "cut off the proposition very abruptly. I said the "religion that I professed made that I could not employ "my pen for the honour of a prince that was employing "his whole force for the destruction of it."

Meanwhile Burnet maintained an active correspondence with England. His services were by no means despised by so eminent a man as Halifax, who employed him in an investigation of some diplomatic importance. Burnet's own intelligence from across the Channel, if not invariably accurate, was at any rate copious. From numerous sources he learnt how Monmouth, no less than Argyll, crossed the Rubicon of revolt, to meet with crushing defeat. For on June 30, Argyll suffered at Edinburgh that last penalty of the law, to which he had been already twice unjustly condemned; while on July 15 following Monmouth expiated, on an English scaffold, the ruin he had brought upon the hapless peasants of the West.

By these events Burnet himself was affected. Three times did the French representative at St James warn him to look to himself; since the English King was strongly possessed with a belief of his complicity in the rising. Burnet however refused to leave Paris till the principal

prisoners had been tried; lest it might seem he feared "discoveries." These proceedings, however, at an end, he resolved to take Barillon's hint. "Colonel" Stouppe (as an at least nominal Protestant) was finding France somewhat too hot to hold him, and Burnet arranged to accompany him on a visit to Italy. They left Paris early in August; and, before the end of the month, had passed by Lyons, Grenoble, Chambery, Geneva, Lauzanne, Berne, to Zurich, whence on September 1, Burnet addressed to Robert Boyle the first of a famous series of letters. Thence, by way of Coire, the Via Mala, and the Splugen, they descended into Italy, and journeyed by the Lakes through Lombardy to Milan, whence is dated Burnet's letter of October 1. Padua and Venice were their chief stages on the road to Florence; where Burnet wrote his third letter (November 5). Quitting Florence, they travelled through the Papal States to Naples, and so on to Rome; Burnet's fourth letter bearing date December 8, just before their departure from the Papal Capital. He then returned to France by way of Marseilles, and made a "tour" through the Southern provinces, where the Huguenot persecution raged. The remainder of the winter Burnet spent in Geneva. Starting with the spring, he then crossed Switzerland to Basle, and passed down the Rhine to Nimeguen on the Dutch frontier; whence his fifth and final letter, dated May 20, 1686, was despatched. He had been travelling nine months.

These letters, which he subsequently revised for publication, are amongst the most characteristic, as they were to prove one of the most popular, of Burnet's works. Lively and entertaining they are still very good reading. Errors of course abound; on which his enemies fastened. The airy confidence with which Burnet, after a sojourn scarcely longer than that of the modern tourist, judges his surroundings, is delightful; but real acumen distinguishes these hasty *obiter dicta*.

On art, of course, his comments are not important. For pictures he cared little, though he admired the Venetians and Holbein. Sculpture excited more enthusiasm; Ghiberti's Gates and the Pietà of Michael Angelo were his favourite modern examples. But the bust

of Socrates at the Farnese Palace interested him more than the famous "Bull"—a "rock of marble cut out into a "whole scene of" (to him) second rate statues. For mediaeval art he had of course a sovereign contempt; Milan Cathedral "hath nothing to commend it of archi- "tecture, it being built in the rude Gothic manner." But the ruins of ancient Rome, with their halo of association, fascinated his attention; and he reserved special admiration for the great aqueducts of the Campagna.

His real interest however centred on the constitution, civil and ecclesiastical, of the various States; on the condition of religion, and of manners, of commerce, and of learning.

As regards the first head, we can scarcely exaggerate the importance of this journey in the development of Burnet's views. He was profoundly struck by the contrast between the comparative comfort prevailing in the barren valleys of Switzerland, and the squalour which had overrun the fertile Italian plains. The Campagna, which was rapidly becoming depopulated, seemed to him more denuded than the poorest parts of Scotland. He recognized indeed that the decay of Italian commerce (consequent on the adoption of the long sea route to India) had dealt a blow at Italian prosperity; but he also realised how much her ruin was due to the rapacity of irresponsible rulers.

In morals and religion the outlook seemed equally gloomy. At Venice especially he deplored the decline of the military spirit; and the prevalence of a dull sensuality, which could not even plead the specious glamour of romance. Superstition and impiety bore forms equally gross; and the adherents of the Molinist revival alone fanned the dying flame of piety.

He had, however, no personal reasons to complain of the Roman Court. Friends at Paris had dissuaded the author of the *Reformation* from entering the lion's den; but, as Montague had shrewdly suggested, the crisis in England demanded amiable tactics. The Pope, says Burnet, "knew "who I was the day after I came to Rome. And he [sent "word] that he had heard of me, and would give me a "private audience abed, to save me from the ceremony of "the pantouffle. But I knew the noise that this would make:

"so I resolved to avoid it, and excused it upon my "speaking Italian so ill as I did." Burnet here showed himself wise, for, as things were, his intimacy with several of the cardinals excited suspicion at home. In conversation with Cardinal D'Estrees, who was interested (from a Gallican standpoint) in the validity of Anglican orders, Burnet unhesitatingly defended their canonical regularity; but avowed his own satisfaction at everything which made the reconciliation more difficult. Cardinal Howard, on the other hand, questioning Burnet concerning the state of public feeling on our shores. While showing Burnet the violent letters of the "forward" Romanists in England he hinted the dislike of the Roman Court for their policy. This could but alienate English sentiment and incapacitate the King of England from opposing the pretensions of France, whether ecclesiastical or territorial. Of these, as churchmen and as Italians, a majority of the College stood in dread.

So frequent indeed was Burnet's intercourse with Howard that some Frenchmen, anxious for relics, obtained his introduction. Burnet happened to call at the moment they received their treasures; and good humoured pleasantries passed. Burnet whispered that it was strange to find himself assisting to distribute "the ware of "Babylon"; and Howard, repeating aloud the jest, bade his hearers tell "how bold" were "the heretics and how mild "the cardinals...at Rome." The "mildness," however, had its limits; "though I did not," says Burnet, "provoke any to "discourse of points of controversy, yet I defended myself "[when] attacked...with the same freedom that I had done "in other places." This "began to be taken notice of"; and Prince Borghese, whose kindness had redeemed his earlier promise, told Burnet it was "time to go."

Any mollifying effect, however, which might have been produced by the flatteries of Rome, was more than counteracted by Burnet's journey through Languedoc. It was a turning point of his career. The "Edict" had been repealed during his stay in Italy; and the horrors of a persecution then at its height left on his impressionable mind irrevocable traces. Had the French king merely decreed the *banishment* of his Protestant subjects, Burnet,

on his own principles, could only have objected the loyalty of the Huguenots, and the solemn sanctions of the Edict. But the infamous policy which denied the refuge of flight, and yet subjected the recalcitrant to every species of mental, moral, and even physical torture, appalled a mind naturally humane. "What I saw and knew there from the first hand" (he writes in his contemporary letters) "hath so confirmed "all the ideas that I had taken from books of the cruelty "of that religion, that I hope the impression...shall never "end but with my life." Nor did he see that political motives cooperated, or that Louis cynically boasted of following Protestant example. Rather he held "that the "French king is [not] to be so much blamed in this matter "as his religion, which without question, obligeth him to "extirpate heretics." Hence it was Burnet derived that almost frantic dread of Roman ascendancy, which became the "fixed idea" of his old age, and was to draw upon him, so frequently, the ridicule of eighteenth century indifference.

Yet repelled as he was by this sinister aspect of Romanism, he is none the less unsparing when he treats of Protestant error. He saw much to condemn even at Geneva; where he was so cordially received and given such facilities for collecting a little English congregation, that he was happier "than I had thought it was possible "for me to have [been] anywhere out of England." More particularly was he grieved at the Calvinistic intolerance which obliged every minister to sign the Consensus Helvetius; and this, while it forced many into exile, imposed on the consciences of others an intolerable burden. "I spoke much to all who came to me of the folly and "wickedness of those impositions. I had then such credit "among them that...what I spoke upon that subject was "not without effect; for they are now...obliged to no "subscriptions but are only liable to censure if they write "or preach against the established doctrine. The mul- "titude and length of their sermons disgusted me "much"; and he thought the people would understand and love the Scripture better if a whole chapter were substituted for the meagre Scriptural text.

Nor was he better satisfied elsewhere. The apathy of

the impending eighteenth century was creeping over continental religion; and the "Pietistic" undercurrent (which was specially distinctive of Germany), did not come under his observation. In Switzerland, in Holland, even (with some striking exceptions) among the Huguenot refugees, he saw little but a real indifference to the claims of religious morality, masked by a factious zeal political rather than pious.

"All these things," adds Burnet, "lay so much on "my thoughts, that I was resolved to retire into some "private place and to spend my life in a course of stricter "piety...and in writing such books as the state of matters "with relation to religion should call for, whether in points "of speculation or practice. All my friends" (he rather inconsequently proceeds) "advised my coming near "England, that I might be easier sent to, and informed "of all our affairs, and might accordingly employ my "thoughts and time. So I...was resolved to have settled "in Groningen or Friezeland." When, however, about May, 1686, he reached Utrecht, he found, as he tells us, "letters writ to me by some of the Prince of Orange's "Court, desiring me to come first to the Hague, and wait "on the Prince and Princess, before I should settle any-"where." Times, in fact, had changed. The Prince was anxious to conciliate the English parties; Lady Russell, whose sufferings made her the idol of the "Whig" remnant, and Halifax, now head of the Moderate Opposition, had both recommended Burnet to the Prince's good graces. He was well received and advised to court the tranquil and dignified publicity distinctive of the Hague, where he was safe from the compromising exiles who haunted the great ports. We must picture him therefore till the end of his stay in Holland walking along canals beneath the shade of spreading lime trees; haunting the Moritzhuis; visiting the prison of the de Witts; and for the first few months welcomed at the Huis ten Bosch.

At the moment when Burnet entered this new arena, James II had been but fifteen months on the throne of England; and already a situation of the utmost delicacy confronted the husband of the heiress presumptive. For James was now an elderly man with a constitution avowedly impaired. The children of his second marriage had all died

in early childhood; and though a recent frustration of fresh hopes was matter of common gossip, the state of his young wife's health seemed to preclude expectation of offspring. Her life was even regarded by Burnet and others as a valuable barrier against the possible remarriage, which might entail on England a further Papist succession. Under these circumstances the internal politics of England became acutely interesting to the Prince; whose European policy hinged entirely on engaging against France the resources of the island realm. On the one hand he was bound to avert, by every means in his power, a breach with her actual ruler; while the fact that his wife might at any moment succeed to the helm, rendered it equally necessary to conciliate her prospective subjects.

It was therefore highly embarrassing to the Prince that James should have definitely brought himself into direct conflict with his people. Ignoring the Test Act, he had thrust his coreligionists into office; and a judicial bench, carefully manipulated, had ostensibly legitimated this policy. Roman priests held benefices in virtue of his dispensation; illegal diplomatic relations existed between Whitehall and the Vatican; a Court of High Commission, in drastic fashion, exercised the Royal Supremacy; and a standing army camped on Blackheath. The trend of policy was unmistakeable. By dint of prerogative, and if necessary of arms, James II meant to force, on an unwilling people, the legitimation, if not the ascendancy, of his own Church and creed.

And how did this state of affairs strike Burnet, his soul still palpitating with horror at the methods by which Louis XIV had thrust the same religion on the unwilling Protestants of Languedoc? To the Erastian enthusiast it seemed hard to see the English civil power once more the officious tool of Jesuitical ambitions. But the preacher of passive obedience saw at this time no hope, save in the future "exaltation"—he means, of course, the regular peaceable succession—of the Prince and Princess of Orange.

Such views lent a zest to the intercourse for which his introductions gave occasion. The advent of a man so distinguished, and so well-versed in the complications of English politics, whether religious or secular, cannot have

been otherwise than welcome at the princely court. Accident increased his importance; and he was received into some degree of intimacy. The Prince even submitted, with unusual docility, to the cross-examination of the English divine as to his views, political and ecclesiastical. The version of their relations which Burnet, nearly twenty years later, incorporated in his *History*, took colour from intervening changes; and it was probably his Exclusionist acquaintance, rather than himself, who feared so much the "arbitrary inclinations" attributed to the Prince—who professed the love of liberty which Burnet ascribes to himself. But the Prince no doubt seized the occasion for reassuring, through so transparent a medium, the apprehensions of the Church, and of the Whigs.

Nor can we quite accept Burnet's complacent estimate of his own persuasive powers. William did not require Burnet's somewhat unpatriotic reminder, that the Dutch fleet should be always ready for a rupture of relations with England. The advice of Mordaunt, who at the close of 1686 (on the appointment of the ecclesiastical commission and the trial of the Bishop of London) urged a breach with James, did not need Burnet's opposition. And we can hardly suppose that the spur of Burnet's exhortations nerved the Princess Mary to plead for her former tutor, and assure him of her sympathy.

And the incident of the Crown matrimonial? That episode remains mysterious. It was not recorded by Burnet till three years later; and he gives no clue to its occasion. The resolute Stadtholder, intent on the elaboration of a vast confederacy against France, and himself third in the line of the presumptive English succession, must indeed have chafed against the precarious nature of a hold upon England which hinged on the eventual complacence of his hitherto neglected wife. But the saturnine Dutchman, on such a topic, would never have confided in the volatile Scot. Benthinck cannot have been the "agent provocateur"; for Benthinck and Burnet, at this time, were on formal terms. But Henry Sydney, the Prince's English favourite, may have lamented to Burnet the Prince's estrangement from his wife—his indifference to the interests of England; and may have ascribed both, in

part, to smouldering political jealousy. At any rate, Burnet, who, as we know, had in 1681 proposed the Prince as Regent, now abruptly broke to the astonished young wife (who had presumed that her rights vested in her husband) the "ridiculous posture" of an English king-consort. To her request for a remedy he boldly proposed, as a means of focussing on herself and her country her husband's affections, that she should undertake to place in his hands, from the moment of her accession, all actual authority: and should do her best to secure him the Crown for life. "I told her," he records in 1691, "nobody could suffer by "this but she and her sister; and it was but too probable "that her sister" (who was but little her junior) "could never "be concerned in it." The simplicity with which the young Princess broached to her husband this strange compact of surrender—and the noble reticence which marked her implied rebuke—are matters of history. We may however doubt whether the Prince's comment, that though nine years married, he had never "had the confidence" to discuss the matter with his wife, was so complimentary as Burnet presumed; or whether the episode increased, so much as Burnet supposes, the Prince's confidence.

Meanwhile, as Burnet puts it, "great notice came to be "taken of the free access and long conferences I had with "them both." The resultant jealousies are quaintly portrayed in the correspondence of Mr Stanley (chaplain to the Princess) with the Bishop of London. The Bishop it seems had originally warned Stanley against the Doctor. "I cannot but take notice," notes Stanley on August $\frac{16}{26}$, "that Dr Burnet will stay here still, and is perpetually "desiring to talk with the Princess in private, and too "often gets the liberty. His design cannot be good, "for it can be only to ruin the Princess's" [religious ?] "reputation, or to piece up his own lost credit by "pretence of her favour. Or else to represent the true "friends of the Church and State ill to her Royal Highness, "and its enemies well. And the consequence of his "intimacy here must be very bad; for men will be apt to "think or suspect, that she is as deceitful and full of tricks "as Dr Burnet." Stanley has, he adds, spoken plainly to the Princess, and he hopes with success; but he begs the

assistance of the Bishop, especially as regards the Prince. "For I am verily persuaded it is only Dr B.'s intolerable "impudence and pressing importunity (observed and "laughed at by all the Court) rather than her kindness "for him, that procures him so frequent accesses....But Dr "B. is everything here. He goes in a cloak like one "of their ministers, and as I am informed the last Sacra- "ment day he received the Sacrament both in the morning "early with the Prince, and at noon with the Princess and "us; but yet he doth not by all this gain on the Prince. I "find that some that have appeared in his behalf to the "Princess have urged for his commendation *that he could "not come up to the heights of some men;* and what this "means we very well know. I know Dr B. is of so bad "repute with all the good Churchmen of London, both "clergy and laity, that nothing can be spoken more to her "R.H.'s injury than to say she is a favourer of him....Dr "B. is so imprudent that he for his intelligence quotes Mr "How the Non-conformist and Mr Penn the Quaker and "such other as his chief or only correspondents."

To these or similar attacks Burnet seems to allude in an unpublished letter to his friend Dr Fall, by this time Principal of Glasgow University, which gives so interesting a picture of Burnet's contemporary views that we make no apology for printing it entire.

My Dear Friend,

I had your letter on a Saturday, just before the critical hour[1] came on, which made your part of it be remembered with a very particular emphasis. For although every thing you say gives a wound, yet at the same time, amidst all that mist, there is enough to temper the trouble that the melancholy strains in it raises with a good measure of joy in God. In short, my dear friend, we are the disciples of the Cross, and we who have passed the greatest part of our life with as much ease and plenty as if our portion were in this world must not think it strange to see our selves ill represented and ill understood even when we know we deserve it the least; and to have friends not only fail us but

[1] *i.e.* the hour of devotion?

to turn our most malicious enemies. I have passed through a great deal of that and you may perhaps have your share in the same ill usage. But we are the followers of him that was made perfect through sufferings, and therefore we ought not to be afraid; for who is he that can harm us if we are the followers of that which is good? I am glad at what you tell me concerning our worthy friends Mr Charteris and Mr Aird; pray remember me most kindly to them and tell them I hope I have still a share in their best thoughts, which I desire as earnestly as I need it much. The things that are a doing among you would surprise me extremely considering what may come to pass hereafter, if I had not seen so much of the folly and fury of some people's tempers as to wonder at nothing; but you may remember of what has passed between you and me on those subjects. You will see a Critique that I have writ on Mr Varillas[1] in which you will perhaps think I have been too severe; but really I thought the occasion required it. Yet I will bear what reproofs you bestow on me for it. Within a few weeks you will see some letters that I have writ concerning the things that appeared most remarkable to me in my little tour, for *travels* sounds too big for so short a ramble. I will anticipate nothing upon that subject, but perhaps even you, that saw most of the places through which I passed, will meet with things that will surprise you. For I writ of nothing but that which is singular, except where the series of other things forces me to bring in common matters. Here I fancy I may stay for some time. I have nothing to do neither with the Scotts at Rotterdam nor with the English that are believed to be in Amsterdam, for as I have seen none of them, so I am resolved that my soul shall never enter into their secrets; and I do assure you I am so entirely possessed with the doctrine of the Cross that I am further than ever from all things that lead to the drawing the sword against those in whose hands God hath put it. So that you may depend upon it that I will never be directly nor indirectly so much as in the knowledge of things of that nature. If God have yet any pleasure in the Reformation He will raise it up again, though I confess the deadness of those Churches that own it make me apprehend that it is

[1] Who had criticized his *History of the Reformation.*

to be quite laid in ashes; for nothing but the mere sense of truth keeps me firm to it, since the scandals that are given even by those of our admired Church of England would otherwise turn a man's stomach against it. Yet we must measure our faith not by the persons that profess it but by a more infallible rule. Otherwise when we read the Epistles that the Apostles wrote to the Churches and those of the 2nd and 3rd Chapter of the Revelation we will find as much as would have disgusted us at the Christian Religion if we had taken our measures concerning it from what we might have seen in those Churches. I writ you no news from this place, as I expect none from you; only I will assure you that upon as large a knowledge as almost is possible for me to arrive to in so short a time of the Princess here, she is the most wonderful person that I ever knew. She has a true and a generous notion of the Christian Religion and her life is an example to all the world. She has a modesty, a sweetness, and a humility in her that cannot be enough admired. She has a vast understanding and knows a great deal; in short she has all that one can wish for to make her one of the greatest blessings that has been in human nature. These things may seem hyperbolical but I do protest sincerely to you I say nothing but what is strictly true. Now the Lord God direct and preserve you. Adieu. When you go to Hamilton make humble compliments in my name, and commend my [*sic*] kindly to P[resident] Sibbald.

Hague, 26 Sept. [1686].

The complaints of the chaplain at the Hague may have stimulated the irritation of King James; who more than once expostulated with his daughter for countenancing a disgraced man. Remonstrance was however useless; the Princess showed Burnet the letters, and even consulted him as to the tone her answers should take.

In November of this year a more important interlude followed. The English king was not without hope that the Stadtholder might extend to English affairs the principles of toleration so characteristic of the Dutch economy. Penn, the celebrated apostle of tolerance, was therefore despatched to the Hague on an informal mission.

He was to obtain, if possible, the Prince's concurrence in an attempt to secure the repeal of the Test Acts; which (though officially overridden) still formally barred the legitimation of Roman Catholic claims. After consultation with Burnet, the Prince returned an answer, exactly calculated to satisfy the English Moderates. He declared himself favourable to a general *toleration*; but inimical to a repeal of the Test; that being the only *practical* security for the predominance of Protestantism under a Papist King.

As unsuccessful was Penn's tentative appeal to Burnet's well-known principles of toleration; on the strength of which, Penn urged Burnet's return to England, and even promised him preferment. But Burnet rejected these overtures, taking his stand on the policy advocated by the Prince. As a natural consequence, about the New Year, 1687, the private expostulations of James on Burnet's own account were supplemented by diplomatic instances. Aware of Burnet's non-resistance fervour, the Prince, as rumour reported, coldly replied that he saw no reason to suspect his loyalty. Prudence however compelled an ostensible disgrace. Burnet remained indeed at the Hague, and maintained, through the medium of Benthinck, correspondence with the princely pair; but eighteen months were to elapse before he saw them again.

The result of the intercourse thus abruptly interrupted may be seen in the interesting characters of William and Mary, which Burnet recorded in this interval of apparent disfavour. His estimate of the Prince is just; his comment prophetic. The Prince's "martial inclination," writes Burnet, "will naturally carry him, when he comes to the "throne of England, to bear down the greatness of France; "and if he but hits the nature of the English nation right "at first, he will be able to give laws to all Europe....But "if the Prince does not in many things change his way, he "will hardly gain the hearts of the nation; his coldness "will look like contempt, and that the English cannot "bear; and they are too impatient to digest that slowness "that is almost become natural to him, in the most "inconsiderable things; and his silent way will pass for "superciliousness. But that which is more important, he

"will be both King of England and Stadtholder; the "Dutch will perhaps think a King of England too great "to be their Stadtholder; and the English will hardly be "brought to trust a Prince that has an army of 30,000 men "...so near them."

The corresponding character of the Princess (like the letter to Fall) foreshadows the passionate loyalty which tinged his later career. It was a loyalty compact of many elements. In it the politician's respect for a discreet sagacity, the patriot's enthusiasm for an essentially patriot Queen, the devotion—half chivalrous, half paternal—of a man many years her senior for a beautiful and gracious woman, merged in the veneration of the divine for one whom he regarded as a saint.

Meanwhile, his apparent disgrace excited the lively satisfaction of the Reverend William Stanley. But the events of the autumn had changed the outlook of his Episcopal correspondent. Stanley's elation seems now to have incurred a rebuke at the hands of my lord of London; for the chaplain's letter of March $\frac{21}{31}$ following is on the defensive tack.

"...Concerning Dr B.: I know he hath complained of "my unkindness to him, though I paid him as much "respect as I think he could expect from me. For he "was here introduced by a French Presbyterian interest, "making his application to none of the Church of England "here; his acquaintance and constant conversation was "only with the disaffected to our Church and State, and "was perpetually intriguing and desiring to have private "discourse with the Prince and Princess &c. which made "everybody jealous of him; and I abstained from his "company both in obedience to your Lordship's letter, and "according to my own judgment, and because I saw he "did by his Elemosynary lecture set up for faction and "popularity here, and courted the women, and some of bad "fame to support his interest, and [I] was at the same time "advertised how jealous the King was of him, and how he "disliked any one's having acquaintance with him. I dare "say if anybody had been here and seen his busy flattering "and insinuating carriage, he would have been as strange "to him as I was, if he at all loved our Church. And I

"saw too that my discountenancing him did somewhat "abate his interest and reputation. And against such a "pressing forwardness as he used, nothing could be "opposed but somewhat that will [?] be pretty public. "And therefore I wholly abstained from his lecture and "company."

By this ostensible banishment from courtlier circles, Burnet was at leisure for the claims of general society. A result followed, which we are fain to relate in his own ingenuous language. "An accident" (he says) "happened "to me...which gave a great turn to the rest of my life. "Hitherto I had lived without children, and by con- "sequence without any great concern with relation to other "persons, except it was for a few friends whom I esteemed "and loved very tenderly. But now a new scene was "opened to me. There was a gentlewoman at the Hague "originally of Scotch extraction, but of a family long "settled in Holland. She was an only child, and was bred "at a great expense, as one of the best fortunes at the "Hague. She was very perfect in music of all sorts, she "both drew and painted to great perfection. She spoke "French, Dutch and English equally well; she had a very "good understanding and a very sweet temper; and was "well instructed in religion, rather like one that had "studied divinity than barely to be a good Christian. "She had continued unmarried till she was 27 year old, "resolving not to marry till she saw a person that she "could like. If" (muses the aged Bishop, for such he was when he penned these lines) "she was not a perfect beauty, "she was very agreeable and was well-shaped." Officious friends tried a little match-making diplomacy. "I was "desired to visit her, but declined; for I had no thoughts "of marriage, but was then looking for a dismal over- "turning of religion and liberty; yet seeing her accident- "ally, I liked her conversation so well, that upon her "invitation, I went to see her[1] and continued to see her "often."

The natural consequences followed; Burnet fell in love. Handsome, agreeable, ardent, in the vigour of life, and with a European reputation in religious and intellectual circles,

[1] The words "upon her invitation" stand deleted.

he as naturally succeeded. Moreover, for the second time, superstition, or, as Burnet calls it, a "belief of absolute "predestination," came to his aid. His first wife had had it foretold to her that she should marry a man bearing Burnet's initials.

"My second wife," he writes, "had [in early youth] "many suitors, but could not bring her mind to consent to "any of them....One of whom she had a great opinion "[then] told her she would be married to a clergyman of "another country; so upon...receiving my address, she "came to think that...I was appointed to be her husband." True love, however, as we shall find, was to meet with its proverbial obstacles.

Meanwhile his stay at the Hague was leaving its mark on Burnet's mental development. As Mr Clarke has pointed out, it was probably his relations with the Dutch Arminians in 1664 which had first shaken Burnet's hold on his ancestral Calvinism. His orthodoxy on this point had been strongly, and no doubt justly, suspected at Glasgow; his letter to Comber, in 1683, shows how far he then was from the Calvinistic standpoint. Intercourse with the heads of the Remonstrant or Arminian community at Amsterdam now doubly strengthened his bias against Calvinism; and confirmed his love of that tolerance for which the Arminians were renowned. Le Clerc, who had been driven from Geneva by the pressure of Calvinistic opinion, translated his remarks on Varillas, and helped to arrange for a French translation of his *Reformation.* Traces of their correspondence survive; and the ingenuous letter in which Burnet sketches the favourable notice of his *History* which he trusts Le Clerc will insert in his own periodical, is specially amusing.

More important are his relations with Van Limborch; one of the noblest men and most learned theologians whom the Remonstrant Church produced. His greatest work, the *Theologia Christiana ad praxin pietatis, ac promotionem Pacis Christ. unice directa,* appeared in 1686; and probably influenced (more especially by its candid treatment of opposing arguments) Burnet's subsequent work on the Articles. Like the rest of the Remonstrant community, Limborch (through the some-

what rationalizing tendencies of his speculations) had fallen under the suspicion of Socinianism. In 1687 he sent Burnet an early presentation copy of his *De Veritate religionis Christianæ*, which takes the form of a dialogue between a Christian and a learned Jew. Burnet professed himself delighted with this work; its "candid" exposition of the Jewish case, and its "convincing" defence of the Christian, pleased him equally. But he was shocked to find that the question of Christ's divinity was studiously ignored, as a belief neither essential to salvation, nor explicitly contained in the Scriptures. Modestly but firmly—in letters of which the Latinity is rather fluent than finished—he remonstrates on this point with the great theologian. "I have written to you," he says, "in haste, but "not rashly; for there is in the whole of theology no topic "which has exercised me longer, or more seriously." He is not one who on such a point would accommodate truth to popular prepossessions; since he is rather too indifferent to the charges which the more rigid school of theologians, in order to excite odium, may formulate on this head. But the "divine worship paid to Christ in the New "Testament" is really "the most serious of all the pre-"judices under which the Jews labour"; since they regard such worship as either idolatrous or polytheistic. Moreover, among careless or hostile critics even in the Christian camp, Van Limborch will himself incur the charge (as Burnet feels certain—the unjust charge) of Socinianism; and such a charge will do both Limborch himself, and the community which he represents, great harm among the English, "who are most fervently attached to this tenet "of the divinity of Christ." Burnet urges the great writer to take the earliest occasion of explaining himself; and in fact points out how it may be done. "The arguments which "have been deduced from the Old Testament in favour of "the doctrine of the Trinity are so slight and so far "beneath a theologian, that you will render the thing less "worthy of yourself and what is more of your cause, if you "even touch on them. The worship of our Lord belongs to "practice, and is to be defended"; but school metaphysics with respect to the Trinity, Personality, or Hypostatic Union are to be avoided. Burnet regrets that "the Fathers

"were led aside from the simplicity of the Gospel, to "distinctions hardly worthy of philosophers, and still less of "theologians; and it were to be wished that this age "could be recalled to a primitive simplicity, which is most "certainly done, when men avoid the exaggerations and "errors common to all parties who engage in such disputes." On the other hand, says Burnet, "I should admit, that if "our Messias had proclaimed himself a God other than "the One Jehovah he would have been justly repudiated; "I should also admit that a multiplication of divinities, or "worship paid to the creature, are monstrous crimes. "I should then admit that Christ is to be worshipped; "whence...I should further deduce that he is God. For "out of the whole contexture, both of the Old and New "Testament, it is apparent that the charge of idolatry "refers to the fact that idols which were no true Gods, "were worshipped....How are these things to be re-"conciled? Here I should not attempt to prove the "Divinity of Christ from the Old or New Testament; "rather I should regard it as a deduction from the worship "rendered to him. But I should show that this difficulty "ought not to weigh with the Jew, who is bound to ascribe "to the Shekinah the name and worship due to God; nor "shall I deny the Shekinah to have been a creature, since, "as it would seem, it was purely a mass of refined and lucent "matter, wrapped in another mass of cloudy matter" (and supernaturally preserved from dissolution), "whence oracles "were issued. If therefore this mass of inanimate matter "bear the name, and receive the worship, due to the "supreme Jehovah, this is enough to convince the Jew, that "if the Divine Man we worship was the Living Oracle of "the Deity, far surpassing their Shekinah, it was right he "should be distinguished by the name and worship due to "God. For, though he was a man, yet (in some fashion "which transcends our comprehension) to him the Deity "was united. And reducing the matter to the laws of a "true philosophy, Union, when it exists between substances "of distinct orders, is nothing but the closest interaction. "And no difficulty is apparent once we have acknowledged "that (in whatever fashion) the interaction of the soul by "which our body is moved, brings about a communication

"of properties. The honour due to the soul is extended "to the body; and in the same way we now also worship "the supreme God, when we worship Christ."

To the cogency of this appeal Van Limborch responded with the "agreeable humility, and affable reception of "criticism" for which, as Burnet says, he was renowned; and the statement which he prepared for publication seemed to Burnet eminently satisfactory.

Yet more important was this interval to Burnet's political development. He still held rigorously aloof from the "Whig" exiles at the ports; among whom, at this time, was John Locke, as yet known to fame merely as Shaftesbury's physician. But none the less the very soil of the United Provinces was a perpetual protest against the doctrine of passive obedience.

Specially significant in this direction was Burnet's intimacy with Corneille Terestein de Halewyn, a judge of the Court of Holland. Eminent in his profession, cultivated in his tastes, he understood "the state of Greek "and Roman Commonwealths" (says Burnet) "beyond "any man I ever knew, except Algernon Sydney"; and he accordingly fraternized with Burnet, to whom the "Roman "authors" were "equally dear." He had a Dutchman's passion for "public liberty"; but his Republicanism was of a sober stamp. It was thus the more calculated to impress the moderate Burnet; whose royalist traditions and strong common sense could not revolt from it, as they had revolted from the crude theoretic Radicalism of the far more brilliant Sydney. For Halewyn, though starting from the premisses of the "Louvestein" or extreme Republican faction, practically favoured what amounted to a limited monarchy. The directly *executive* functions of the States-General seemed to him the fatal flaw in the Dutch constitution; and Burnet, who had noticed that the counsels of an English Parliament were generally as bad as its criticism was sound, acquiesced in this opinion. With Halewyn's desire for the separation of Executive and Legislature, had dawned on the Dutchman a new respect for the hereditary principle. The "factions and animosities" in almost all their towns, made him as averse to parity in the State as was Burnet to

parity in the Church. For power, so Halewyn argued, if exercised by right of birth, excites less envy than when wielded by a former equal. Moreover, Halewyn had become convinced that, all errors notwithstanding, William was sincerely devoted to the fortunes of the United Provinces; and that the maintenance of a factious opposition must consequently ruin the country. From a teacher so sanely practical, Burnet will more readily have absorbed the doctrine, that even as regards political "resistance"—"Salus populi suprema est lex."

Meanwhile his personal relations with the English Court had reached a stage of acute tension. In January or February 1687, appeared at Amsterdam Burnet's Travels. They created an enormous sensation; within about a month the fifth edition was in the press at Amsterdam; and a French translation in progress. As this "succès de scandale" was entirely due to their lurid picture of countries blessed in double measure with Popery and arbitrary Government, the irritation of the English Court may be imagined. The sale was prohibited in England, and all copies in circulation this side of the Channel were as far as possible seized. The book however seems to have been immediately reprinted in England; and such was the demand that by July it was again almost unprocurable. Burnet's anonymous *Animadversions* on certain *Reflections* which the Travels had occasioned appeared more than a year later, and are principally remarkable for a fine eulogy of Plutarch "the greatest of all the ancient authors."

But this was not the worst of his offences. On February 12, 1687, James II published his Scotch Declaration of Indulgence with its ill-starred allusion to "Our absolute power...which all our subjects are bound "to obey without reserve." The well-deserved strictures which almost immediately issued, were, though anonymous, justly ascribed to Burnet.

Again, the apt and sarcastic *Reasons against the repealing the* [English] *Test* which appeared anonymously before March 21, were also attributed, as justly, to Burnet's fertile pen; and seem to have evoked a famous retort.

Early in April the Poet Laureate, Dryden, (who with courtly alacrity had apostatized to Rome), published his

celebrated ecclesiastical satire *The Hind and the Panther.* Of this amorphous allegory, composed, it is said, on a hint from the highest quarters, the final episode describes how the Pigeons or Church of England Clergy chose for their representative the Buzzard. Under this pseudonym we are supposed to recognize our friend Dr Burnet.

Various motives have been imagined for this rather irrelevant onslaught; but Dryden's epithet "The Captain "of the Test" suggests that Dryden, at the last moment, had orders to scarify the author of the pamphlet against Repeal. We give this famous and singularly exasperating portrait.

"A portly Prince, and goodly to the sight
"He seemed a son of Anak for his height,
"Like those whom stature did to crowns prefer
"Blackbrowed and bluff, like Homer's Jupiter;
"Broad-backed and brawny, built for love's delight,
"A prophet formed to make a female proselyte.
"A theologue more by need than genial bent;
"By breeding sharp, by nature confident,
"Interest in all his actions was discerned;
"More learned than honest, more a wit than learned;
"Or forced by fear or by his profit led,
"Or both conjoined, his native clime he fled:
"But brought the virtues of his heaven along;
"A fair behaviour, and a fluent tongue.
"And yet with all his arts he could not thrive,
"The most unlucky parasite alive;
"Loud praises to prepare his paths he sent,
"And then himself pursued his compliment;
"But by reverse of fortune chased away
"His gifts no longer than their author stay;...
"...Oft has he flattered and blasphemed the same,
"For in his rage he spares no sovereign's name:
"The hero and the tyrant change their style
"By the same measure that they frown or smile.
"...His praise of foes is venomously nice;
"So touched it turns a virtue to a vice...
"...Seven Sacraments he wisely does disown
"Because he knows Confession stands for one;
"...But he, uncalled, his patron to control,
"Divulged the secret whispers of his soul;
"Stood forth the accusing Satan of his crimes,
"And offered to the Moloch of the times.
"Prompt to assail and careless of defence,
"Invulnerable in his impudence,
"He dares the world, and eager of a name,

"He thrusts about, and justles into fame.
"Frontless and satire-proof, he scours the streets
"And runs an Indian muck at all he meets.
"So fond of loud report, that not to miss
"Of being known (his last and utmost bliss)
"He rather would be known for what he is."

Seldom in the history of satire have more severe blows been dealt, even by the "mailed fist" of Dryden; and we find, without surprise, that Burnet retorted on him.

Meanwhile, the appearance on April 4, 1687, of the *English* Declaration of Indulgence—(which had preceded by but a few days that of Dryden's poem) evoked from Burnet some further anonymous *Reflections*. They are very important; for Burnet subsequently represented this Declaration as the real justification of the English Revolution.

To the *principle* of Toleration, Burnet, in this Tract shows himself openly favourable; and he regards a Parliamentary revision of the severe penal laws against Papists as eminently to be desired. "But" (he adds) "I will "take the boldness to add...*that the King's* [*wholesale*] "*suspending of laws strikes at the root of this whole* "*government and subverts it quite*"; for though "*the* "*executive power of the Law is entirely in the King; and* "*the Law...has...made it unlawful upon any pretence what-*"*soever to resist* [*it*]...[*yet*] *the Legislative power is not so* "*entirely in the King....No law can be either made,* "*repealed, or which is all one, suspended, but by...consent* "[*of Parliament*]." And since "*the essence of all government* "*consists in the subjects of the legislative authority*" the "*placing this legislative power singly in the King is* "*a subversion of this whole government.*" To occasional acts of executive violence or injustice "all Princes" are "subject"; and since the facts may be uncertain, or the law doubtful, and public tranquillity is more important "than "any private oppressions" the "peace of mankind were "very ill secured, if it were not unlawful to resist...any "*ill-administrations*....But the total *subversion* of a govern-"ment being so contrary to the trust that is given to the "Prince...will put men upon uneasy and dangerous "inquiries, which will turn little to the advantage of those "who are driving matters to such a doubtful and desperate

"issue." In reading this, we seem to look upon a human soul, tossed by the struggle between old dogmas and new convictions. Burnet has indeed moved far from the pure doctrines of passive obedience; yet strives to persuade himself that he holds their essence still. In fact he hesitated for some little time ere he entrusted (even anonymously) such language to the press.

The exact month of its appearance is not known, so we cannot tell whether it did, or did not, spur the English Government to a fresh act of hostility. The news of his impending marriage with a Dutch heiress had reached England; and in hopes of breaking off the match "The "King," says Burnet, "writ himself to Scotland ordering his "advocate to prosecute me; and his Advocate, having no "matter against me, threw together such things as he could "fancy might be true." This sarcasm hits off very neatly the terms of the "Criminal Letters" against him which issued at Edinburgh, April $\frac{19}{29}$, 1687, with a citation to June 27. The actual charge was that of intercourse with escaped traitors, notably with Argyll; the dates 1681 and 1685 being as it were alternatively offered. "I had," says Burnet, "the news [that this impended] before the King's "envoy had it; and it came to me just the night before "I was to be contracted."

The young lady however showed a fine spirit. "I was" (says Burnet) "so happy in her temper that she was not "frighted, on the contrary, that brought our marriage on "the sooner." Meanwhile Judge Halewyn "proposed an "expedient of which the Prince approved, which was that "the next morning I should petition the States of Holland "to be naturalized. This was so reasonable, and seemed "to be so much of a piece with my contract that was to "be signed in the afternoon that it passed without "opposition; for it was not known that there was any "other design in it; and by this means I passed under "the protection of the States."

This unwelcome intelligence Burnet communicated to the English Secretary of State, in a letter dated May 10 (N.S. ?). A dignified epistle, with an underlying strain of polite insolence, its professions are not quite in accord with the tone of the above-mentioned *Reflections*. Burnet

had not yet received full particulars of the charge; but he could with justice repel it *in toto*. Few, he adds "have writ more and preached oftener against all sorts "of treasonable doctrines and practices than myself." He had not been in Scotland for thirteen years; and during the last five "I have not so much as mentioned the commonest "news in any letter [sent thither]....I went out of England, "by his Majesty's approbation; and I have stayed out "of it, because his Majesty expressed his dislike of my "returning...." Naturalized on the eve of marriage, "during my stay here, my allegiance is translated from "his Majesty to the Sovereignty of this province; yet "*I will never depart from the profoundest respect to his "sacred person, and duty to his Government.*" Nor has he, since his "coming into these parts," seen "any one "person...that is outlawed for treason." His "engage-"ments" rather than personal fear preclude his responding to the summons: "I can very easily part with a small "estate and with a life of which I have been long weary." If condemned in absence, however, he must publish, for his own vindication, an apology *pro vita sua*, covering the events of the last twenty years, and containing (he hints) matter scarcely calculated for the Royal ear. This of course alludes to his "secret" memoirs.

A fortnight after the date of this irritating epistle Burnet was married. His meditations on the occasion thank Heaven for the protection which has brought him so far on his way. He asserts the purity of his motives. "Thou that knowest all things, knowest that neither the "follies nor heats of nature, nor the levities of a wandering "fancy, nor...the wealth...that accompanies the person "determined me....It was somewhat of thy image that "I discerned in the person herself, and the characters of "thy Providence that were so apparently obvious in the "progress of it." He prays the "God of love" for that "calm of mind, that union of thoughts, and that tender "concern in one another, and chiefly in one another's soul" which conduce to spiritual welfare; for the rest, let God provide.

The details of the Citation were now to hand; and two days later (May 17 O.S.) Burnet forwarded, under cover

to the Secretary, a detailed answer addressed to the English King. In these documents he mentions, *inter alia*, that, since his arrival at the Hague, he had anathematized through an entire sermon "treasonable doctrines and "practices." He announces his intention of printing the correspondence within the fortnight, unless proceedings should be stayed; and argues that his assassination, under a sentence of outlawry, would bring the guilt of his blood on the head of its promoters.

As a matter of fact the prosecution was let fall; but as, in the following June, a fresh suit was initiated (on the plea of a traitorous transfer of allegiance, and a threat to reveal Royal Secrets), Burnet, on June 27 O.S. sent his papers to the press. In his preface he complained that since it is "yet too early to set on a persecution...for... "religion,...crimes against the State must be pretended." The English Envoy, in a memorial to the States of Holland, remonstrated against language which implied the Royal sanction upon schemes of assassination. Yet by a clumsy admission that Burnet might be lawfully arrested "in what manner soever," he rather gave away his cause. The hint was significant, and Burnet, during the month of July, drew up a kind of spiritual "Will and "Testament" now unfortunately lost.

On August 9 O.S., the date for which he was cited, he of course failed to appear; but sentence of outlawry was deferred. This the French Ambassador at the Hague thought a sign of great weakness. Burnet, after the delay had lasted some weeks, traced in it a desire "to see if the "terror of it would bring me to make submission. And "to frighten me the more" (he adds), "the English Envoy "has talked with several of his spies of a design he had to "carry me away; though the methods that he proposed "were so ridiculous, and he opened it to so many persons "that all came to my knowledge....I have taken my own "way, and have not entered into any state of treaty, "though my friends in London have writ me word that "several overtures have been made to reconcile me to "the Court." On August 29 (September 8) his sentence was actually pronounced. It put Burnet out of the King's protection; entailed the (immediate) forfeiture of personal

estate ; and (at a year's notice) the confiscation of all life interest in real estate.

"I hear now," writes Burnet, "sentence is past ; and "whether upon this any of the brutal Irish that are here "in the service will endeavour to merit at the King's hands "by destroying me, I do not know nor am I much con- "cerned ; for I am weary of life and of the world. So all "my apprehensions are that they may make an attempt upon "me that shall go only half way, and of all things in the "world an operation of surgery is that which I apprehend "the most....I resign myself up entirely to that providence "which has hitherto watched over me with such an indulgent "care that what my enemies have designed against me, "as the greatest mischief they could do me by driving me "out of England, has produced the happiest alteration in "the course of my life that could have befallen me, and "that which gives me the perfectest quiet and content." He evidently alludes to his marriage.

He now gave (so rumour declared) a farewell dinner to some friends ; of whom he took solemn leave, as one under the shadow of death, with whom they must no longer converse. Enemies subsequently ridiculed these heroics ; in which we may perhaps trace the histrionic touch proper to the orator. But Burnet had seen Warriston, under a similar sentence, dragged from the Continent to a Scottish scaffold. His cousin Jerviswood, moreover, three years before, had suffered at Edinburgh under exceptionable cruel circumstances. He may be pardoned therefore for taking a more serious view of his position than did his "arm chair" critics.

There is indeed no possibility of doubting the reality of his danger. During the winter of 1688 the English Envoy returned twice to the charge with a demand for his extradition, and when, after Burnet had been examined by the States, the demand was refused, "the King," says Burnet, "took the matter very ill, and said it was an "affront to him, and a just cause of war." Swift, in one of the rude notes which he appended to Burnet's *History*, stigmatized this story as the dream of a "vain fop." It is certain, however, that the King (who spoke bitterly of Burnet as a "pernicious man," whom "no man knew...

"so well as himself") was greatly incensed at the check; and the despatches of the various Ambassadors to the Court of Whitehall shew that language as strong as that ridiculed by Swift was actually employed by the English King. More subtle tactics were however in contemplation. On December 30 (January 9), Louis XIV, presumably irritated by Burnet's pro-Huguenot attitude, wrote to his Ambassador in London. He promised facilities to anyone, who having kidnapped Burnet, should wish to convey him into England by way of France.

Some hint of these intrigues seems to have got abroad; and Burnet's friends, including Stillingfleet and Halifax, were greatly alarmed. His cousin and former pupil, James Johnston (himself a son of the ill-fated Warriston), wrote in February, from London, to his correspondents at the Hague; blaming Burnet for his presumptuous indifference and protesting that his vanity of shewing his courage only betrays his folly. Another warning reached Burnet from a very surprising quarter. The Lord Chancellor Jeffreys had been consulted by the King, as to what further steps were possible. Jeffreys by his own account responded, that since the States had given Burnet their protection, he did not see what more could be done. The King seemed annoyed; and Jeffreys (why, does not appear) gave Burnet an account of the incident. No less startling was the channel of the message. It was sent (says Burnet's Memoirs) through "a friend" of his own. This friend, in the *History*, becomes the notorious Kirke; whose brutalities after Sedgmoor Burnet, in a previous passage of these very Memoirs, had justly reprobated.

Moreover on March $\frac{4}{14}$ Burnet received (from a reputable and well-informed source, to which Johnston was privy), an anonymous hint that an unsigned order for £3000 to the person who should abduct him had been seen lying in the Secretary's office at Whitehall. "I thank God," wrote Burnet in his Memoirs on receiving the letter, "this "has given me no sort of disorder; it has obliged me to use "a little more than ordinary caution; and that is all "the effect it has had. I offer myself up to God and... "have settled all things that related to me as if I f[ace]d "present death; but with all this I must add to the praise

"of true Christianity and of philosophy that I never possessed "myself during my whole life in a more pleasant and clearer "cheerfulness of spirit."

And yet, the circumstances were such as might well have disturbed his serenity; for in March, 1688, his first-born child saw the light. It was a son, who received the name of William; and for whom the Prince and Princess (to our envoy's disgust) assumed, by proxy, the responsibilities of sponsorship.

An event, however, so important to his affectionate nature finds no place in his Memoirs. The period thus momentous to himself had been one of public crisis; and the crisis was becoming more acute. The year 1687 from April to October had been occupied by the dramatic struggle between James and the Fellows of Magdalen. Burnet seems to have written to the Princess, giving it as his judgment that the King's aggression on the freehold of the Fellows did not justify forcible resistance. At the same time, however, he drew up a significant paper on the "Measures of Submission," which in an expanded form we shall meet later on. Meanwhile the determination of the Prince and Princess to uphold the Tests had been emphasized in the Fagel-Stewart correspondence, to which Burnet, as translator, had been privy; and he did not ignore the crucial importance of the episode. "I give the account of "this negotiation the more particularly" (say his Memoirs at the close of 1687) "both because I am certainly "informed of it by messages which the Prince sends me, "and because this is like to be the cause of a rupture that "may have great consequences. France apprehends the "Prince's being on the throne of England above all things; "so they will certainly push on the King...to embroil "matters both in England, and between the King and "Prince....On the other hand, the extremity to which the "King has driven matters will throw the nation into great "confusions; which it will be very hard to manage. For "either the nation will lose heart, and then a multitude "will become the feeblest thing in the world; or if the "vigour of the subjects is still kept up, it will be hard to "govern this, and to keep it from breaking out upon great "provocations; chiefly if a force is put upon the elections

"of parliament men, which strikes at all. And if there "should be a commotion, or if the violence of the Irish "should create a disorder in that island, the Prince will be "reduced to great difficulties; the ties of nature will make "it hard for him to head a rising against his father-in-law; "but on the other hand, if the King's ill-conduct throws the "nation into such a violent fermentation, then a rebellion "that prospers will turn into a commonwealth; and if it is "subdued, it will put all things in the King's hands....[Where] "nature and honour, religion and interest all pull different "ways it will not be easy to come to a resolution. A war "at home...will naturally bring over a French army, in whose "hands the King will put such places as are in his power. "And thus we are like to become a scene of blood and "horror again; and the outrageous counsels of a few "priests...are like to bring England again to the very brink "of the precipice, and very near its ruin. It is true" (he adds) "there is a report now generally believed to be true, "which may change the whole scene. It is said that the "Queen is with child. This piece of news is so fit for their "affairs at present that this tempts many to doubt of it. "Yet it seems to be true; and if [it] proves in conclusion "such as they desire" (*i.e.* a son) "it will extremely feed the "superstition of the party; for besides the seasonableness "of it,...they give out that this conception was the effect of a "vow....And indeed of the Queen that brought a great many "children in the freshness of her youth...which were all so "unhealthy that they died quickly, should now, after so much "sickness...bear a healthy son, it would look on all hands "as a very particular stroke of providence, that was almost "a miracle....But it must be considered that I am out of "England so that I now see things by other men's eyes."

At the same time, about the beginning of the year 1688, the curious controversial correspondence between James and his daughter Mary, to which Burnet was privy, raised to the highest point his respect for the Princess's capacity; it marked the last confidential intercourse between father and child.

Meanwhile Burnet's pen was active as ever. His political tracts were marked by an increasing acerbity. This culminated in April, 1688, with a retort to *Parliamentum*

Pacificum, a pamphlet which had spared neither "Their "High Mightinesses" the States-General nor himself. Burnet's *Reflections*, which had a wide circulation, were described by James II as "the most seditious" he had "ever yet writ"; and booksellers guilty of selling them were bound over to keep the peace. The tract is indeed remarkable for bland exasperating irony. "Peace," says our sarcastic divine, "is a very desirable thing; yet every "state that is peaceable is not blindly to be courted. An "apoplexy is the most peaceable state in which a man's "body can be laid: yet few would desire to pacify the "humours of their body at that rate. An implicit faith "and absolute slavery are the most peaceable things that "can be; yet we confess we have no mind to try so "dangerous an experiment" [etc. etc. etc.].

But Burnet's activity was mainly among surface eddies. He knew little of the practical under-currents which were settling the destinies of his nation. Very early in May 1688 N.S., for instance, (ostensibly on a visit to a sister), Mr Russell, a cousin of Lord Russell's, repaired to the Hague. In Burnet's contemporary Memoirs this journey is not even mentioned; and at the time he was certainly ignorant of the facts that Russell bore pressing instances from the heads of the English Malcontents; that these urged the Prince's immediate intervention; and that the Prince positively demanded, as an indispensable preliminary, a written invitation from the leaders. Three years later, however, Burnet left it on record that Russell had dropped some hints to him, the terms of which remain obscure. They certainly presupposed the possibility of the Prince's forcible intervention. For Burnet represents himself as responding, that affairs on the Continent being favourable, he "believed they might depend upon the "Prince being able to come over by the end of the year." Possibly however this merely contemplated the then obvious probability of war between England and the States.

The events of the next few weeks in England were dramatically startling. On May 7 N.S. (*i.e.* we presume during Russell's absence at the Hague) there had issued the second Declaration of Indulgence. On May 28 N.S. seven of the Bishops refused to sanction its publication; on June

18 N.S. they were committed to the Tower. Two days later the birth of a son and heir was unexpectedly announced at St James's; and on July 10 N.S. the seven Bishops, tried at the King's Bench for a seditious libel, were acquitted amid thunderous applause. Among the boisterous rejoicings of the following night, few noticed the unostentatious meeting held at Lord Shrewsbury's town house; after which Mr Herbert, disguised as a sailor, left for the Continent.

As respects the advent of a Royal Heir, whose birth indefinitely postponed a Protestant succession, Burnet, it is clear, honestly shared the prevalent suspicions of fraud. No exception can be taken to the version of the affair included by Burnet in his Memoirs of September following; it is a straightforward record of information received, in which stress is naturally laid on suspicious detail.

And he had special means of information which he regarded as specially important; he was privy to the reports received by Princess Mary from her sister, Princess Anne. These reports have been severely, but we think unjustly, criticised. The rumours were insistent; the issues at stake enormous; the Princess Anne, who had not been present, was dependent on hearsay; and interested politicians had an object in biassing a spirit naturally docile. Nor can any one deny that there was *prima facie* cause for suspicion. The pressing motives for imposture; the ascendancy of Jesuits at the Court; the state of the Queen's health; the imprudent exultation of the Papists; the unexpected coincidence of the birth with the absence of the Princess; and the ostentatious indifference of the Royal Pair to the satisfaction of public opinion gave ground for "honest doubt." Considering the throngs of both sexes whose presence custom required when a Royal Heir saw the light, it seems still almost incredible that no one was summoned who could be supposed to represent the interests of the dispossessed heirs.

This aspect of the case particularly impressed Burnet; who published anonymously, during July or August, a curious account of the stringent safeguards against fraud, by which the Roman Law, in the interest of presumptive heirs, surrounded the advent of a posthumous child.

In the affair of the Bishops' trial, two things arrested

his attention: the blow dealt by the verdict to an unlimited dispensing power; and the intense excitement the matter had caused in England.

Such was Burnet's attitude when, on July 16 N.S., Mr Herbert reached the Hague; bearing in secret with him a momentous document signed with seven cyphers. Almost immediately afterwards Burnet was informed, by whom does not appear, that the Prince designed a forcible invasion of England, in the interests of English discontent; and that "some" (it should have been "one") of the "Bishops," thought the Prince "had a just cause of making a war on "the King."

With this view, our one-time advocate of Passive Obedience found himself in hearty concurrence. "It was "plain" (say his contemporary Memoirs) "that the King "was now setting about the total subversion of the Govern- "ment"; and that he hoped to effect this by means of a servile Parliament, for which the Committee which manipulated the borough constituencies was rapidly paving the way. Thenceforward, with thorough zest, did Burnet embrace the Prince's cause; believing himself to discern, in the favourable progress of events, the hand of an approving Providence.

In justice to Burnet's detractors we must point out how unfortunate for Burnet's reputation, on this as on other occasions, was the date of his avowed conversion. For the train of public aggression, which had led up to the crisis, coincided with a train of personal injuries, which had left Burnet an outlaw with a price upon his head. On Lord Russell at the foot of the scaffold he could urge (cried his enemies) the doctrine of non-resistance; but personal danger (so they argued) provoked his own summary recantation. Such were the taunts of the conscientious "de "Jure" men; and such were to some extent the sentiments of Halifax himself, who still laboured for a constitutional solution and who could not forget the Burnet of 1683.

This interpretation, none the less, was as false as it was natural. A tight boot, of course, affects our estimate of the shoemaker. But in the main, the process of Burnet's conversion (a lengthy and gradual proceeding) had been due to the drastic teaching of public events.

Burnet, however, did his best to deprive himself of this line of defence. Vehemently he asserted that his views in their continuity had undergone no modification. "I have ever," he says, in a second self-vindicatory answer to the pamphlet *Parliamentum Pacificum*, "gone by the "principles in which I was bred...under a father that "from first to last adhered to the King's cause...but was "as much an enemy to arbitrary power as he was to "rebellion....I went no further than to assert an obedience "and submission according to law, when I was employed "to assert the laws of Scotland against those who studied "to overturn them." This is mere special pleading. His later views were no doubt the expansion of a germ latent in his earliest speculations. Even the *Vindication of...the Church and State of Scotland* had admitted that if a king "be furious," if he "desert his right," if he "expose his "kingdoms to the fury of others...the abuse is such that it "tends to a total subversion"; and the King may be reputed under a phrensy, "since no man is capable" [of such policy] "till he be under some lesion of his mind." In such circumstances "the states of the land are to be the "administrators of the power, till he recover himself." In other words, the community is allowed to safeguard itself against the cruelty or caprice of a ruler actually insane. But James II was certainly *compos mentis*; and it was a perverse and premature Hegelianism on Burnet's part to "annihilate difference" and regard his undeveloped views as equivalent to their later developments.

Yet the extent of Burnet's transformation must not be exaggerated. He was never in any sense what we call a democrat, or even a "radical reformer." The strong and consistent supporter of Monarchy, "republican" innovation he abhorred. Nothing but a "total subversion" could for him legitimate revolt; and his views on "total sub-"version" underwent no further evolution.

Meanwhile, his contemporaneous knowledge as to the course of the Prince's intrigues remained of the vaguest. He knew nothing till long afterwards of the above-mentioned cypher-signed missive, with its curiously general appeal for armed assistance, to be rendered in a capacity undefined. For his ignorance of detail he gives a

magnanimous reason. As a Scot, he was liable to the judicial torture still sanctioned by Scottish law; and he desired, in case of the worst, to secure his friends against himself. Probably however (as in 1683) the choice was not entirely his own, and the men who risked their necks in the conspiracy declined to place them at the mercy of one so seldom reticent. We doubt if he would have been initiated even to the most modest extent, had not his literary services been in imperative request.

It was he who translated, and contrived somewhat to curtail, the rather ponderous "Declaration" prepared by the Prince's Dutch confidant, Fagel. This announced that the recent infractions upon the laws of England, and the doubts which hung over the Queen's supposed delivery, had induced the Prince, upon the invitation of men of all ranks, to go "over into England," and "see for "proper...remedies...in a parliament...lawfully chosen." The preservation of the Established Church, a comprehension for such Protestant dissenters as could be comprehended, and a toleration for the rest, were included among the Prince's expressed aspirations.

Hereupon arose bitter discussions, prophetic of the bitter feuds of thirty bitter years. In an interesting *Apology for the Church of England* Burnet had recently charged the State, and Romanist intrigue, with the guilt of Caroline persecution; and had emphasized the pacific sentiments towards the Protestant Non-conformists which recent events had evoked from the leaders of the Established Church. In his heart however fears obtruded lest the complacence thus elicited should perish with the crisis which gave it birth. Meanwhile the semi-Republican "Whigs" in *Holland* sought to embroil the Prince with the Church and "Tory" interests by inducing him to ignore the wrongs inflicted on the Establishment. These tactics (which excited Burnet's reprobation) were frustrated by the common sense of the *English* "Whigs"; and Burnet, in his own "Whiggish" old age, stigmatised the outlawed agitators with extreme severity. "I saw," he says, "even in Holland the [Whig extremists] "were utterly against" a reconciliation between the Church and the Dissenters; "they desired only a

"toleration, but seemed to apprehend the Church would "be too secure and grow too strong" unless they could "keep up a party" against "the Church. I suspected," adds Burnet, "many of these were in their hearts enemies to the "Christian religion, so their views might be the enervating "Christianity by keeping up of parties among us."

Burnet also warned the Prince against the Scots at the Hague, who, in the draught of a Scotch declaration, had implicitly committed the Prince to Presbyterian Church government. How far the Prince was secretly pre-engaged is not known; but he gave immediate orders to eliminate the compromising passage.

Still more important were Burnet's pamphleteering efforts. His anonymous *Enquiry into the measures of submission to the supreme authority, and...the grounds on which it may be lawful or necessary for subjects to defend their religion, lives, and liberties*, had been sketched out for the Princess as early as 1687. It was now recast; and by the Prince's directions, several thousand copies were printed for distribution by the invading force.

This important paper, it must be remembered, preceded by eighteen months Locke's *Essay on Government*. It embodies much of the reasoning employed by Burnet in his early non-resistance speculations; but with decisive qualifications. The law of nature, it is urged, acknowledges no political subordination, save that of child to parent, wife to husband; though we may contract away our freedom we are born free. Self-preservation, again, is a natural duty; it demands the resistance of "violent "aggressors," the exaction of "just damages," and future safeguards from those whose aggression is past. The power of exacting reparation is vested (by the compromise which originates society) in a common trustee. The "supreme power" is that which *regulates*, not that which *executes*, the methods of reparation; the executive in fact is the creature of the Legislature. The *measures* of obedience in any society are Legislative Acts, oaths and prescription; but the presumption favours liberty, as the elder principle. The New Testament sanctifies no *system*, but preaches obedience to *the powers that be*. The propaga-

tion of Christianity by *force*, the *forcible* resistance of *legalized* persecution are by it specifically forbidden. But if our religion is established by law, its exercise is a branch of our property, and may therefore be defended. Moreover, as our laws give the King but a share in legislation, an invasion upon the legislative function of Parliament may be resisted. But what of the Militia Act, which vests in the King all the force of the kingdom, and condemns opposition to his warrant? What of Non-resistance, the "constant "doctrine of the Church of England"? Are we to hold such opinions as long as we are favoured by the Crown, and desert them when ourselves abandoned? No. Yet in all obligation lies hid an implicit reserve; adultery (he argues) can dissolve the very marriage bond. Where ultimate principles collide, the less must yield to the greater. A law condemns resistance; but cannot in so doing destroy all other law; and a king who subverts the law that sanctions him "ceases to be king." The most monarchical lawyers (so Burnet reminds us) acknowledge some bounds to submission. A madman is *ipso facto* incapable of reigning; the supersession of a King of Portugal, on the plea of insanity, has been condoned by all Europe. Burnet then summarises the encroachments of James upon the laws of England, and concludes with the suspicions of fraud attaching to the birth of a prince.

Meanwhile, not content with these services of the pen, Burnet tried his 'prentice hand at self-authorised diplomatic intrigue. The security of the Dutch frontiers, during William's intended absence, caused the Prince much concern. The Duke of Hanover, who had married the niece of Charles I, had been in the French interest. "I ventured," says Burnet, "to send [the duchess] a message by one "of their court who was then at the Hague." He revealed the design on England; with an indiscretion none the less great because it was no doubt belated. The argument which, fifteen years later, he represents himself as having used, shew that his anticipations of the future had run very far; and contemplated a certain supersession of the newly-born claimant. "If we succeeded," so ran his plea, "certainly a perpetual exclusion of all papists from the "Crown would be enacted." And since, after the two

Princesses, and the Prince himself, Duchess Sophia was the nearest Protestant in the line of succession, "I was," says Burnet, "very confident" the Duke's adhesion to "our "interests" would secure her claim. The Duchess, he says, received the hint with alacrity, an interpretation entirely negatived by her subsequent attitude; her husband, though he joined the coalition, was then as ever, genuinely indifferent to her English prospects.

After the fact, Burnet told the Prince. "He," declares Burnet, "approved of it heartily; but was particularly glad "I had done it of myself without...engaging him in it"; since it would look ill if England learnt he "already "reckoned himself so far master, as to be forming projects" of succession.

A sarcasm may have underlain this retort. The Prince had certainly not left his relations with Hanover at the mercy of a diplomatic amateur. Cunningham, where he treats of Burnet, is generally misinformed, and always malicious; but on this occasion he perhaps hits the mark. "Dr Burnet," he sneers, "intermeddling in all people's "affairs seemed to think of himself as if he had the care of "all the Churches; and had also been able to manage the "public affairs of all Europe. He told the Prince of "Orange that he had provided forces for the security of "his frontiers, and had written to the Princess Sophia on "that subject. The Prince replied to Burnet, in an "ironical manner: 'Well done! You have provided well "'for us indeed!' for he knew that the German troops are "not wont to move without ready pay; not through the "persuasions of women, and much less for the tedious "harangues of a chaplain."

Nor did Burnet's zeal stop here. Some weeks earlier he had received a hint that on the rupture of diplomatic relations with England he should be appointed a chaplain to the Prince. He therefore made the offer of his "poor person "to go along" with the Prince; for, as he adds with artless self-importance, "having thought that it was lawful, I judged "it had been a very unbecoming fear in me, to have taken "care of mine own person when the Prince ventured his." Whether the Prince was pleased may be doubted; but the offer could hardly be declined. In accordance however

with the above-mentioned stipulation he was not personally installed as chaplain till the eve of the actual embarkation.

In the midst of this political agitation, our indefatigable divine found time for ecclesiastical debate. On September 10 he dated a reply to Bossuet's account of the dogmatic "variations" characteristic of Protestant Churches. For in that work Burnet's *Reformation* had been treated as the authoritative test-book of English Protestantism. Burnet's answer is substantially a *tu quoque*; with the rider that variations in an admittedly fallible Church must be venial, while they are fatal to the pretensions of one professing infallibility. Certain passages in the tract have an immediate significance. Thus our Erastian admits that Cranmer "*in opposition to the Ecclesiastical Tyranny*" *may have raised* "*the power of the Civil Magistrate too* "*high.*" To the charge that the Anglican acknowledges a lay supremacy, Burnet retorts that a lay servitude far heavier lies on the Gallican Church. She obeys an arbitrary monarch; while under our "legal government" any order not founded on law "is null of itself."

The crisis now drew very near; and Burnet sat down to compose a kind of dying testimony "intending it for my "last words, in case this expedition should prove either "unsuccessful in general or fatal to myself in my own "particular." He denies that he is inflamed by "the "injustice and violence with which the Court of England "had first ordered me to be judged in Scotland and then "...murdered in Holland." He repudiates the idea that he is "wrought on by any ambitious or covetous prospect of "raising my own fortunes by contributing to procure "a revolution in England." And he disclaims animosity against Papists as such. "I am none of those [that] "aggravate matters, or that let myself be governed by the "spirit of a party. I love all men that love God and that "live well, and can make great allowances for errors...; for "in that I have very large notions of the goodness of that "God of love, whose mercies I could never limit to any "one form...of religion. And so I am none of those that "damn all Papists; for I have known many good...men "among them. Therefore...though I think their Church "is full of...pernicious [errors]...in...doctrine and worship,...

"above all in the casuistical divinity and in the con-
"duct...of...confessions;...the chief ground of my abhor-
"rence of that Church is the carnal, designing, ambitious,
"crafty, perfidious, and above all that cruel spirit that
"reigns among them...most eminently among the Jesuits,
"who are the pests of human society and the reproach of
"the Christian religion; so that...I should not dread the
"progress of Mahomedanism, or the return of Paganism...
"as I do the authority which that society begins to have
"in...the Popish Courts of Europe."

He recapitulates in brief the arguments of the *Enquiry*; and his contention that they are identical with "all that "I ever writ or preached on the subject." Moreover, as he says, "I have gone no further but to give my opinion "both to the Prince of Orange and some other...persons, "that I looked on the thing as very lawful...but I never "set myself to advise or to press it." In general "He "that knows all things knows...that I have made it the "business of my whole life, though in the midst of many "and great imperfections" to walk worthily before Him. "And as I am perfectly assured...of the truth of the "Christian and of the Protestant religion, so those matters "are so dear to me that if I had a thousand lives I would "venture them all with joy in this cause....And I must "sincerely protest to the world that all the true joys that "I have ever known have flowed from [religion], as all the "sorrows of my life have flowed from my strayings out of "that way....I have ever hated and despised superstition of "all sorts; and have found a great deal of it even among "those that pretend to be the farthest from it; nor could I "ever consider Religion...but as it furnished me with... "principles...raising me to a constant love to God and my "neighbour; and a continual desire of doing all the good "that was possible."

He leaves directions, in the event of his death, for the posthumous publication of certain MSS. These include the unfinished *Essays on Morality and Religion*; about 200 MS. sermons; and the *Secret History*. His other MSS. he reserves for his son, who, he hopes, may take orders.

"I continue..." he adds, "to love all my [many] friends...

"for...I have lived a life of friendships....No man ever had "greater reasons to love a wife most tenderly than myself "...[and] I will carry with me to the last moment of my "life the entirest affections for her...and I do most humbly "[and confidently] commend her, and my son, and what "she goes with, to the blessings of the God of my life... "and...to the care and kindness of...my friends."

He concludes with an impassioned dedication of himself to God. "If thou raises me to any eminent post in thy "Church I will study to be an example of humility...will "withdraw as much as may be from all Courts and secular "affairs, and will consecrate myself to the work of the "Gospel [and] to the healing of our breaches." He prostrates himself in the dust as unworthy of the meanest office; "let thy name be glorified and...this great under- "taking succeed" while the shame that is his due falls on him that prays. Perchance however sins (national or private) will call upon the enterprise a divine chastisement. "If thou calls me to suffer, support and lead me...through the "Valley of the Shadow of Death; for [if] thou art with me "I fear nothing that devils can contrive or...men exercise "against me. Bring me at last where thou art, O my God "and my all; for thither am I continually aspiring.... "Amen. Amen."

It only remained to complete, up to the current date, his *Secret History*; and the embarkation of the troops had actually begun ere Burnet had laid down his pen.

"And now" (he concludes) "within a week or two...one "of the greatest designs...undertaken for many ages [will "be] brought...near a point....[It] is as just as it is great, "and the Prince as far as it is possible to see into a man's "heart, goes into it with great and noble intentions." He seems pre-ordained for the doing of marvels; if he succeed, and "manage" the English "as dexterously as he hath "hitherto done the Dutch, he will be the arbiter of all "Europe, and will very quickly bring Lewis the Great to "a much humbler posture; and will acquire a much juster "right to the title of Great....But...I am an historian, not "a prophet; therefore I do now interrupt the thread of "this history. Whether I shall live...to carry it on...is "only known to that God to whom I most humbly resign

"myself....Thus I conclude at the Hague the third of "October [1688]."

He had yet to undergo a final interview with the Princess; the first for more than two years. She was "solemn" with "a great load on her spirits," but a conscience at rest. In the long talk which ensued Burnet spoke confidently of success; and hinted that any want of harmony between the Princely couple would ruin all. The Princess reproved these fears; all attempts at intrigue should be nipped by her in the bud.

On October 29 N.S. the great expedition sailed.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REVOLUTION.

WHETHER Burnet's estimate of his own place in the armada entirely tallied with that of its promoters lies open to question. Deference to his simple self-importance may have prompted the request that he should "manage" the uncertain temper and certain pride of the Prince's English Admiral, Herbert. The letters which Burnet accordingly addressed to that dissolute irascible seaman have been preserved; and a quainter medley of personal excitement, the newsmonger's zeal, and perfunctory solicitude for the spiritual interests of the recipient, it would be difficult to conceive. The first dates from the Hague, after a celebrated storm had beaten back the fleet. It reports to Herbert (who remained on the flag-ship) rumours of the hurried concessions with which the King was fain to propitiate the English nation. "This," says Burnet (one of the thirteen excepted from amnesty), "must complete "his ruin and shew the meanness of his soul...softness "which comes so late can...but...make him cheaper."

On November $\frac{1}{11}$ "with the evening tide" the fleet restarted; Burnet as a "domestic" of the Prince being in the first vessel. The wind proved very fair; and on the evening of the fourth day Mr Russell and his pilot boarded the leading ship. Orders were given to bring the squadron short of Dartmouth. But with dawn it grew only too clear that the fleet had oversailed the mark; and Russell, in despair, bade Burnet "go to his "prayers." At that moment the wind veered; and four hours later the fleet rode safely within Tor Bay.

With characteristic promptitude Burnet sought the Prince. He found him "cheerfuller than ordinary." The

doctrine of absolute decrees, the keystone of the Prince's philosophy, had been argued between them at the Hague; and the Prince now "took" Burnet "heartily by the hand," and "asked me" (says the divine) "if I would not now "believe predestination?" "I told him," adds Burnet, "I would never forget the Providence of God which "had appeared so signally on this occasion." The omens seemed indeed favourable. It was the fifth of November O.S.; the anniversary doubly auspicious; the weather phenomenally mild. Hardly was the landing completed, two days later, ere the wind veered again; a hurricane drove the fleet of James to shelter in Portsmouth Harbour. "I never," says Burnet, "found a "disposition to superstition in my temper. I was rather "inclined to be philosophical" (*i.e.* to explain things scientifically) "...yet I must confess that this strange "ordering of the winds and seasons...could not but make "deep impressions on me."

The expedition now proceeded, in excellent spirits, towards the capital of the West. On November 8 an advanced guard entered Exeter; and Burnet accompanied it. He was charged to conciliate the clergy, to whom the Bishop and Dean had set the example of flight; and to arrange for a service of Thanksgiving, to take place on the arriving of the army. His reception was not encouraging; the Chapter declined to attend. Jacobites, with allowable hyperbole, represent him as requisitioning, (at the point, so to speak, of the bayonet), the services of a Minor Canon; and tell a story, which, if not true, deserves to be so, of that dignitary's subsequent revenge. The service however took place, with marked omission of the prayer for the Prince of Wales. At the close Burnet (who had preached on the last verse of the 107th Psalm) read out the Prince's Declaration. The choir stampeded; but Burnet's "God save the Prince of Orange" evoked fervent response from the remaining congregation.

So far the expedition, if unopposed, was also scantily reinforced. By November 16, however, when Burnet again wrote to Herbert, he could boast some important accessions. "We begin," he adds, "to work a little on the "clergy; for they are now promoting a petition for a free

"Parliament, which is understood to be a declaring for us." In short, he jubilantly maintains "everything goes as well "as our hearts could wish."

Meanwhile his pen was not idle. To him was entrusted the draught of the famous Association, which bound the revolted chiefs to a reciprocal fidelity; bidding them revenge their commander if murdered, and uphold, in all events, liberty and religion. On November $\frac{19}{29}$ moreover, we find Burnet characteristically regretting the want of a printing press; since, as he puts it, "the world is so made that "it believes nothing but what it sees in print." His *Reflections* on the Prince's Declaration, though composed at Exeter, must have been consequently printed elsewhere.

In these *Reflections* Burnet publicly ridicules the King's tardy reversal of his previous policy. In especial he satirizes the belated attempt to satisfy the nation, by the publication of formal evidence, as to the parentage of the young Prince.

His attitude on this head drew down upon Burnet the frequent and deserved reprobation of Jacobite writers. The account of the event, which Burnet, ere leaving Holland, had incorporated in his Memoirs, is, as we have already pointed out, a candid relation of circumstances really suspicious. The evidence just published however had placed the episode in a different light. It was now sworn by competent witnesses, several undoubtedly Protestant, that authorized hopes had been formed; and by others, as competent, if somewhat less disinterested, that the Queen had been delivered of a son. A credulous obstinacy might still demur to evidence some of which emanated from quarters rather suspect. To the trained intelligence of Burnet however, who, in the light of his own recent elevation to the honours of paternity, had closely scrutinized the depositions, these should have proved conclusive. But Burnet's new political convictions were not so secure that they could dispense with subsidiary justification. We are not edified by the persistence which clings to an exploded legend; by the petty subterfuge which wriggles beneath unwelcome testimony; by the credulity which swallows the most egregious of old wives' tales; including those collected by the learned, but not

very judicious prelate, Bishop Lloyd of St Asaph's. Like a lawyer who alternates the pleas of innocence and justification, Burnet hovers between the charges of a complete and a supplementary fraud; and such disingenuity becomes ludicrous, when, as in the *History*, these pleas dovetail one into another. Swift is almost justified in his cruel sarcasm that, on Burnet's shewing, three successive infants had been palmed on an expectant nation.

In the same paper Burnet repudiates, with apparent indignation, two hostile charges: I. That the Dutch troops will be retained till after a Session; II. That the Prince aspires to be *King*.

Adherents now came in fast, and the Prince was slowly advancing. Writing on November 29 O.S. from Sherborne, Burnet announces that the King's favourite, Lord Churchill, and his Majesty's son-in-law, Prince George, have repaired to the Prince's camp. The treachery of Churchill shewed peculiarly ugly features; and the evidence suggests that Burnet was thoroughly disgusted.

To James the blow proved stunning; he knew not where to turn; his Court honeycombed with disaffection, further resistance seemed futile.

The invaders next paused at Salisbury, where the contemptuous gesture with which Burnet rose from his knees in the Cathedral when the prayer for the King was read, occasioned bitter comment; and, on the ninth of December O.S., the Prince reached Hungerford.

Here the crisis occurred; for James, driven to bay, at length offered to treat. These overtures were certainly deceptive; his hand had merely been forced by the pressure of opinion around, Moderates and "Tories" included; and he had revenged himself by conferring upon Halifax the onus of a delusive negotiation. The latter well knew that the Franco-Jesuit interest was urging the King to flight; and desirous, no doubt, to frustrate these fatal counsels, determined to "pump" Burnet. "Halifax," says Burnet, "desired earnestly to speak with me in private; "but when I asked the Prince's order, he forbid me to do "it. Yet in the crowd [Halifax] asked me (but so as "nobody perceived it) whether we had a mind to have the

"King in our hands or to let him go. I answered, nothing "could be so happy as to let him go, if he had a mind to it." Halifax knew enough; but the Prince, to whom Burnet reported the incident, did not disallow his answer.

In the event, articles were actually concerted between the Commissioners and the Prince; and preliminaries arranged for the meeting of a free Parliament, which both James and William should attend. The Commissioners despatched an express to London to inform the King of their success, and themselves followed close upon it.

The Prince, in the expected interval, determined to visit Oxford, which had sent him a congratulatory address. At Abingdon, however, rumours informed him that the King had fled the country. The report seemed incredible, till confirmed by express from the Commissioners.

From that moment the ball was at the Prince's foot. Turning to Burnet he exclaimed (to use Burnet's language) that "though I was not much disposed to believe King "Charles a prophet, yet the last time he had seen him... "he had...said...if [his brother] were once a King he would "never...hold it out *four years*." It was three years and a little over ten months since James had ascended the throne amid general acclamation.

To Burnet the event brought mingled exultation and relief. "Desertion" of a kingdom, even among ultra-Royalists, had always entailed the abrogation of royal functions; and had been specifically adduced in this connection by Burnet's early *Vindication*. Scruples seemed to him annihilated as by a providential hand.

Anarchy, in fact, would have certainly followed the King's evasion of his duties had not an opportune meeting of Peers been fixed for the ensuing day. This body, of which Halifax became the leading spirit, grasped with admirable promptitude the abandoned reins of government. It offered to co-operate with the Prince in arrangements for a free Parliament; while the City, more impetuous, formally invited him to London. As the roads swarmed with soldiers, deliberately disbanded by James, William however could not outmarch his army. It was not till December 14 that he reached Windsor; and there, on the following morning the crucial blow fell.

Burnet rose habitually betimes. He was perhaps the only person astir, when, "very early," two gentlemen arrived post-haste at the gates of Windsor Castle. They were from Feversham in Kent; one was named Napleton, and their business appeared urgent. Being "addressed" to Burnet, they brought him startling news. The fugitive King, on the verge of escape, had been arrested, not without indignity, by fishermen of the vicinity; they enquired the Prince's pleasure. "I," says Burnet, "was "affected with this dismal reverse of the fortune of a great "Prince more than I think fit to express."—"He wept "like any crocodile," sneers the Jacobite Hickes, who claims (at one remove) the authority of Napleton himself. "And "pray Mr Napleton, said he, still wiping his eyes, carry "my duty to the King, and let him know my concern for "him." But the political results of the arrest soon rushed into his mind; the King (whatever his intentions) had not carried his "desertion" into effect. "Why," he impetuously exclaimed, "did you not let the King go?"—"To which," says Hickes, "Mr Napleton made answer, 'Sir, we could "'not govern the rabble, and if the King had offered to "'go they would have torn him in pieces.'" Twice after, says Hickes, did the same despairing enquiry evoke the same answer, which was the third time given with some emotion. "Eh but, Mr Napleton, saith he again, you "should have let him go"; *i.e.*, sneers Hickes, "you "should have let him be murdered by the mob." To this horrible interpretation Burnet indignantly demurs; adducing Napleton's testimony to Burnet's vehement "God forbid!"—and Hickes' own witness to Burnet's expressed solicitude.

Meanwhile, action was imperative. "I went," says Burnet, "immediately to Benthinck, and got him to go "into the Prince, and let him know what had happened, "that some order might be [instantly] taken for the "security of the King's person....The Prince ordered "Zuylestein to go immediately to Feversham, and to see "the King safe, and at full liberty to go whithersoever "he pleased."

These orders presupposed that the King would continue his flight; and the Prince was bitterly mortified when a messenger crossed his own. This emissary intimated

that the King was returning to London; that he desired a personal conference with the Prince; and invited him to St James' Palace, with what forces he pleased.

William, driven into a corner, now affected to treat his father-in-law as the general of a defeated army. He arrested the messenger, who had brought no safe conduct; and despatched an express with the request that James should remain at Rochester. Meanwhile, however, to the relief of the general public, the King had reached London. He frowned on the men who had saved his capital from the mob; and Halifax, as head of the provisional government, sought refuge in the Prince's camp.

Animated discussions followed. William declined to place his father-in-law under strict arrest; but while striving to throw on others the onus of the decision, he wished him removed from London. The wisdom of this step is questionable; the unwisdom of the methods adopted is quite undisputed. To arouse the King at midnight with an order to leave London; to replace by Dutch troops the English guards at Whitehall—these things were calculated to arouse English pity and provoke English pride; and they nearly succeeded in causing a sanguinary conflict. James however submitted; and the Prince, who was already at Sion, entered London some hours after his father-in-law had left it, under protest, for Rochester.

The situation was now decidedly anxious. "If," wrote Burnet years later, "King James had to any tolerable "degree kept up his spirits the work would have been "difficult if not doubtful; for we saw how variable multi- "tudes are by the joy that was in London upon the King's "return...and the message sent by the Prince to the King "at midnight to withdraw from Whitehall, struck a general "damp upon many, not only in London, but over the whole "nation. The compassion turned then on his side."

Burnet as usual was ready with his own advice. Either at Windsor or Sion he had drawn up, for the Prince's perusal, a curious paper of ecclesiastical counsel. Ten clergymen are commended to the Prince's particular notice; Tillotson, Tenison, Sharp, Wake, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Fowler, Horneck, Sherlock, and Ayrshott. Of these the

four first rose to metropolitan rank; the three next attained episcopal honours; the eighth and ninth adorned the pulpit and the press. *Per contra* Burnet warned the Prince against Bishop Crew of Durham, the Ecclesiastical Commissioner; against Hall, the notorious Bishop of Oxford; against Watson, Bishop of St David's, who was to become yet more notorious. He advised the rescinding of James' ecclesiastical appointments; a reinstation of his worthier nominees; and care in the future choice of Royal Chaplains; "for the rule was formerly "to take all Bishops out of that body." The Bishop of London should be consulted; and meanwhile Burnet ventures to suggest Dr Birch, Mr Wake, and Finch the Warden of All Souls.

Turning to more general topics, he urges the discouragement of intemperate rejoicings; instancing the Declaration to a similar effect issued by Charles II in 1660, no very hopeful precedent. He gravely admonishes the Prince to keep the English troops in order; recommends a solemn Te Deum when the Prince reaches London; and hints the propriety of a regular attendance at "prayers in the lobby." It seems in fact that on the way up the country the Prince had given some offence by attending (as Stadtholder of the States) the ministrations of his Dutch chaplain.

Meanwhile in the critical state of affairs the more reckless of the Prince's advisers desired him to seize the Crown. He of course declined, and on December 20 summoned the Peers then in town to arrange for the meeting of a free Parliament. "My Lord Halifax," writes a sarcastic observer, "I saw this day in a deep conference "with Burnet, who is the Prince's clerk of his closet, and "chaplain, and a great man of State."

On Saturday the 22nd the Peers thus summoned (Lord Halifax presiding) resolved that the King, who was still at Rochester, should be requested to issue the writs; and then adjourned over Sunday.

On that Sunday, at St James' Chapel, Burnet preached before the Prince a fine sermon on the text "It is the "Lord's doing." He traces, as he ever loved to trace, the "providential" steps of the affair; and his allusions seem

doubly impressive in their vivid contemporary garb. But his hearers (he adds) must not merely talk about these wonders, as we talk of "other Revolutions." They must give God the glory; refraining from faction and from those "criminal excesses" which had so marred "the great "Revolution" of "the year Sixty." The atheist is reminded that "standing up for the Protestant Religion" does not warrant an impartial scorn for "all that is sacred." The preacher expresses a hope that men, in their due distrust of Popery, will not emulate its spirit of persecution; urges charity for the fellow-Protestant; and draws from the signal instance before his hearers on which it does not become him to dilate, the moral that God can blast counsels repugnant to his will.

Next day (Christmas Eve) the Peers, on assembling, encountered startling intelligence. Urged by a letter from his Queen, which William had carefully forwarded, James a few hours before had taken ship for France.

Great was the relief at St James'. "If [the King] had "stayed at Rochester" wrote Burnet, twenty-two years later, "the difficulty in the Convention would have become "insuperable." But things, even thus, were not as they had been at the time of the King's first flight. "We have "now," wrote Burnet to Herbert, on Christmas day, "turn "upon luck; the foolish men of Feversham by stopping the "King at first, have thrown us into an uneasy after game. "Compassion has begun to work, especially since the Prince "sent him word to leave Whitehall." A legal Parliament being now impossible, two expedients had been broached. One was to summon "together with the Peers, all such as "have been Parliament men" to declare Princess Mary Queen. Writs for a legal Parliament would then issue in her name. "Others think that a Parliament, or rather a "Convention is to be summoned (which will be the true "representative of the kingdom),...to judge both the King's "falling from the Crown and the birth of the pretended "Prince." This assembly would have to declare who is actually King, and thus entitled to issue the writs. "This "last is liable to the exception that the slowness of it may "expose Holland," which had actually broken with France, to serious danger. "I have not time" (adds Burnet) "by reason

"of many impertinent people that press in upon me, to give "you a fuller detail of our affairs. Your reflections on "the poor King's misfortunes are worthy of you; I could "hardly have thought that anything relating to him could "have given me so much compassion as I find his condition "has done. I know," says Burnet (with obvious reference to Churchill), "it was not possible for you to have acted as "some others have done. But whatever one may think of "that, we must now shut our mouths; for there is dis-"content enough already, and the army seem generally out "of humour and uneasy at what they have done; and you "know we have not the arts of cajolery." Herbert, he concludes, must secure a holiday ere "we make a new "expedition into France; for I do verily believe the Prince "designs it this summer."

These complaints of the Prince's stiffness reappear in the final autobiography. "The Prince's...cold reserved way" (says Burnet in 1710) "disobliged all that came near him, "while his favourite Benthinck provoked them beyond "expression by his roughness." The tension created by the King's ejection from Whitehall, was meanwhile increased by the remonstrance which the exile left behind; and Burnet attempted to combat the reaction by his *Reflections* on that letter "published by Authority." The facts of this defence are correct; but its special pleading cannot put a gracious face on an essentially impolitic expedient. It was, however, the Prince who recalled Burnet's order that prayers for King James should be omitted in the chapel of St James'.

Eventually a Convention was summoned; and in the three weeks pause which intervened great was the general excitement. Burnet, as he allows, spent a good deal of his time "arguing with several sorts of people"; so that he was "well acquainted with men's schemes and reasonings." Such disputations must have strangely reminded him of old "Exclusion" days; and all the more so, because, in this case also his own opinion appears to have changed during the course of the discussions. In a curious undated memorandum, found among the Sidney papers, and evidently belonging to the interval we now consider, he candidly marshals the respective arguments for a deposi-

tion and a Regency. Burnet allows that retention of the Royal style will accentuate the importance of James; he admits the constitutional sacro-sanctity attaching to the title of King; he adduces precedents of Parliamentary deposition; and he accentuates the famous statute of Henry VII, which exonerates the adherents of a "King *de "facto*." But none the less he evidently leans to the appointment of a *Regency*, as the milder censure, shewing "less "ambition and more respect." To a Regent moreover must accrue the exceptional revenue settled on King James. Actual deposition on the other hand "may seem to subject "the Crown too much to the people"; for the Crown might be regranted on *conditions*. Deposition would alienate "many of the high clergy"; and might entail the formalities of a trial. Could not King James, under the Regency scheme, be induced to settle in Italy; subsisting on a handsome allowance, to be forfeited upon breach of the conditions?

It is probable that this paper was meant for the Prince's eye. If so, Burnet must have soon realised that his plan lacked the essence of vitality; namely the Prince's consent to accept responsibility in any lower capacity than that of King. For Burnet's *Enquiry into the present state of affairs*, published anonymously "by Authority" on the eve of the Convention, was presumably "inspired"; and the arguments *against* a Regency here hold the field. A treaty is impossible with one resolved against satisfaction; when, too, the nation has seen "what insignificant things" are "promises and oaths" when "Popery is in the other scale." Protection and allegiance being reciprocal terms, James by his encroachments and his "desertion" has forfeited the allegiance of his subjects. Where allegiance is forfeit, oaths no longer bind; as the matrimonial vow dissolves "when ..the essence of the bond is broke." And if the Oath of Allegiance still binds, it binds "to a great deal "more than those that are for treating seem willing to "allow." If the King ceases to be King, the next heir becomes "the only lawful and rightful King; and if the next "is a *Feme Covert*, then by the law of Nations which... "communicat[es]...all the rights of the wife to the husband "this is likewise communicated." So surprising a restate-

ment of constitutional law naturally opens the question of the "*pretended* Prince of Wales" (*i.e.* of course the child *claimant* of that title); and our pamphleteer urges that considering the language used by the King the mere broaching of the issue is to him an unpardonable insult. Burnet hereupon deprecates the dangers of delay. He proposes a solemn pronouncement that a Popish King and a Protestant Kingdom are incompatible. Of this opinion, he adds, were many "before the King came to the Crown." Since then his Majesty "has convinced the whole nation "of it." Let the Convention next summarize the whole "course of his government," including the "desertion" and the disbandment of the forces; which latter left a great army "under the greatest temptation to live like banditti." The "accident at Feversham" was no true "return"; let the people therefore declare the throne void. Nor should "the great and learned body which has so triumphed over "popery in their late contests with it"—(he means the clergy of the Church of England)—obstruct a settlement; distasteful as may be an implied confession of "once "having been in an error."

These suggestive hints were not lost on the Convention, which met January 22. For on January 29 the majority in the Lower House submitted to the Peers its two famous Resolutions: I. That King James II has *abdicated* the Government, and that the throne is *vacant*. II. That a Popish King is found by experience incompatible with a Protestant Government. Animated debates ensued, during which the pretence of investigation into the legitimacy of the young Prince was on all sides tacitly abandoned. Indeed as the *corpus delicti*, the infant himself, had been removed to a foreign and inferentially hostile land, there to be bred a Papist, it is difficult to see where investigations could begin or end.

On January 31st affairs reached a deadlock. For the Regency party in the Lords coalesced with Lord Danby, who maintained the devolution of the Crown on the Princess Mary. It thus secured the rejection of the Clause importing a *vacancy* of the Crown.

That very day had been selected as a day of thanksgiving "for the deliverance of this Nation from Popery and

"Arbitrary Power by the...Prince of Orange's means." Burnet preached before the Commons, and gave them a fine sermon on National Happiness. The essence of such happiness he believes to consist in this; "that the hedges "be not broken" where the subject or the nation is concerned. After dwelling on the recent deliverance from Popery and France, he urges his countrymen to repay, in suitable fashion, the friendly offices of the States. At home let them uphold the true source of even temporal prosperity—the Fear of the Lord. In fine the preacher pleads for Justice; for Tolerance; for Ecclesiastical Comprehension; for a more adequate remuneration of the undignified clergy; and for a Reform of the Ecclesiastical Laws.

Business resumed at St Stephen's, a new complication appeared. Halifax, the President of the Lords (now a strong adherent of the Prince), wished to vest the Crown Imperial in the Prince alone, with remainder to the two Princesses.

Burnet, who had never contemplated the complete supersession of Mary, was greatly shocked; and placed invidious interpretation on the motives of his former friend. "How far," he wrote fifteen years later, "the Prince himself "entertained this I cannot tell"; but the attitude of his *alter ego*, Benthinck, was significant in the extreme. He seemed "possessed" with the idea, in which he was obviously "well instructed"; affected to consult Burnet on the subject, yet betrayed his own prepossessions. For many hours they argued "till it was pretty far in the morning." To Benthinck's arguments, says Burnet, "I answered with some "vehemence that this was a very ill return for the steps the "Princess had made to the Prince three years ago:...it "would meet with great opposition, and give a general ill "impression of the Prince, as insatiable and jealous in his "ambition. There was an ill-humour already spreading... "through the nation and through the clergy; it was not "necessary to increase it....Such a step...would engage the "one sex generally against the Prince; and in time they "might feel the effects of that very sensibly....For my...part "I should think myself bound to oppose it all I could, con-"sidering what had passed in Holland." Next morning, in fact, Burnet actually sought Benthinck and desired his

"congé"; "that I might be free to oppose this proposition "with all [my] strength and credit." Benthinck desired him to wait, till he saw such steps taken; and "I heard no "more of this."

Burnet's indignation, though rather illogical, for he was perfectly prepared to postpone the claims of Princess Anne, no doubt anticipated the sentiments of the nation.

In fine, Danby, the head of her so-called "party," appealed to the Princess herself, only to receive an impressive rebuke; and William meanwhile took public occasion of announcing that he should decline the Regency, or a merely matrimonial Crown. Matters being once more in suspense, Burnet, as usual, interfered. Through Benthinck he asked the Prince's leave for giving publicity to the sentiments of the Princess. The Prince on this left Burnet "to his own thoughts." He at once related to the principal men the story of Mary's renunciation; and his hearers assured him it helped not a little "to settle all "people's minds."

A compromise was finally affected; William and Mary were voted Joint Sovereigns for life. On February 12 Princess Mary arrived from Holland; and the sprightly levity of her manner excited general censure. The Whigs sneered; the grave Evelyn records his disapproval; to Jacobites she seemed a second Tullia; and even Burnet was pained. He remonstrated some days later; "with her "usual goodness" she pardoned his "freedom," and gave her pathetic explanation. The tragedy of the situation was only too patent to her thoughts; but she had not dared to give way; gravity, much less grief (so her husband had warned her), would have been ascribed to resentment at her own partial supersession. And acting an alien part, she perforce had played it ill.

On the day following her arrival—Ash Wednesday, 1689—William III and Mary II were proclaimed King and Queen.

CHAPTER VIII.

REIGN OF WILLIAM AND MARY, 1689–94.

It was obvious from the first that the new Sovereigns owed to the signal services of Burnet some signal recognition. He was at once appointed a Royal Chaplain and Clerk of the Royal Closet; and it seemed at one time as if the princely See of Durham awaited his acceptance. The Bishop, Lord Crewe, thought to avert a storm by retiring; and offered to resign in Burnet's favour, "trusting" that Burnet's "generosity" would allow him a thousand a year. Burnet refused terms which he described as simonical; but his friends anticipated an unconditional surrender of the See. At this moment, however, Compton, Bishop of London, urged his own claims to promotion, and Crewe, who disliked Compton, hereupon reconsidered his decision.

The See of Salisbury, meanwhile, lay actually vacant; its Bishop having died early in January preceding. Burnet's friends now urged his claim, but without his sanction; since Burnet was himself anxious for Lloyd's translation. He even spoke to the new King on the subject, who "coldly" refused his petition; and the next day nominated Burnet himself "in a way" (says Burnet) "that was much more obliging than I could have "expected."

For Burnet at this time was by no means in William's good graces. His officious zeal—a loquacity which, if sometimes happy, was more often disastrous—an inordinate love of exhortation—were qualities not to the taste of the despotic and taciturn Dutchman. Burnet's championship of Princess Mary must have increased the tension; and Burnet himself relates, complacently enough, his crowning

offence. "I was set on," he says, "by many, to speak to "[the King] to change his cold way; but he cut me off "when I entered upon a freedom with him, so that I could "not go through with it." Undeterred however, "I wrote," he says, "a very plain letter to let him see the turn the "nation was making from him; this offended him so that "for some months...I was not admitted to speak to him."

External evidence exists to the unqualified aversion which the usually self-contained monarch at this moment evinced for his garrulous chaplain. "I never" (writes Lord Halifax, a few weeks later) "heard the King say "a kind word of him." The King "wished he knew" everyone "as well as he knew" Burnet; called him a "dangerous man" without "principles" who would do more harm than twenty men could do good; and declared that his wish to be of the Council should never be realised. It is even recorded, on the authority of Dyckveldt, that the King once actually called Burnet "een rechte Tartuffe"; a regular Pecksniff would be our modern expression.

Mary, on the other hand (herself intensely devout), recognized the sincerity which, amid many foibles, characterized Burnet's piety. "When I waited on the Queen" (he says) "she told me she hoped I would set a pattern to "others, and would put in practice those notions with which "I had taken the liberty sometimes to entertain her." She approved the scheme of life which Burnet had framed; and only added a hope that the young heiress, now about to assume the responsibilities of a Bishop's wife, should (by simplicity of attire and humility of deportment) accommodate herself to the position. She would thus set an example which (as Burnet maintains) was woefully to seek among the parsons' wives of the day. Mrs Burnet, her husband adds, very readily acquiesced in "so reason-"able" a requirement.

Before the consecration could take place, however, great difficulties supervened. Archbishop Sancroft, a conscientious man, devoid of statesmanlike decision, displayed the vacillation which had marred his conduct throughout. He at first refused to consecrate Burnet, though for a diocese canonically vacant. But finding that recalcitrancy must provoke a premunire, he adopted the

irregular course of granting his suffragans a commission to execute, during pleasure, his metropolitan functions. There is still extant a letter from his chancellor, in which that official undertakes to use his own name as often, and his Grace's as seldom, as may be possible, during the formalities preceding Burnet's installation. Such sophistry deserved Burnet's reprobation; and his resentment was not unnatural. The strong dislike of Sancroft which tinges his later *History* was, however, conceived on a subsequent and a marked provocation.

Eventually, on Easter Day, after a week of complete retirement and a night of solemn vigil, Burnet was consecrated by the Bishops of London, Winchester, Llandaff, St Asaph's, and Carlisle, Dr Horneck preaching the consecration sermon (subsequently printed by Burnet's wish) wherein the new Bishop is stirred to a reforming zeal. It is pleasant to find the new prelate petitioning that certain customary fees might be diverted from the St Paul's Rebuilding Fund "towards the repairing of the "ancient and magnificent structure of the Church of Sarum, "which needs many and great reparations."

Three days later Burnet was sworn Chancellor of the Garter; Windsor, the headquarters of the Order, being then within the bounds of his See. Less than a week afterwards he had to preach the Coronation Sermon, on which Macaulay lavishes a well-deserved encomium. It is indeed a fine picture of the Responsibilities of Power. Tyranny now rises level with Anarchy in the catalogue of evils. "The one makes men beasts of prey...the other... "of burden....Happy we...whose laws are neither writ on "sand—nor with blood."

Locke, who had returned from exile after the Revolution, and who was not very enthusiastic with respect to Burnet, seems to have admired the sermon; but he cannot refrain from a satirical touch, which his biographer calls rather spiteful. "Whether," he wrote to Le Clerc— "whether, as you persuade yourself, he will shew the "same spirit at Salisbury as he did at Amsterdam, some "people begin to doubt. I must tell you a piece of gossip "about him." When visiting the King for the first time after consecration, his Majesty had noticed the breadth

of his shovel-hat. "The Bishop replied that this was "a shape suited to his dignity. 'I hope,' said the King, "'that the hat won't turn your head.'"

By this elevation, Burnet at once leapt into three spheres of activity. His diocesan ties he regarded as the most important, and from the purely theoretic standpoint he regretted his Parliamentary functions. "The attendance "on Parliaments" (he wrote, twenty years later) "...puts us "to a great charge, besides the calling us off the half of the "year from doing our duty." He did his best to minimize this evil. His correspondence, and the journals of the House, confirm his son's allegation, that he always procured leave to remain in his diocese as late, and return to it as early, as public business would permit. During the first year of the new settlement, however, his duties as a Member of Convocation and a Peer of Parliament were so onerous as to leave little time for diocesan activity.

Nor did Burnet, from the personal point of view, resent this obligation. He, who had so often deprecated ecclesiastical extensions into the purely secular sphere, yet welcomed, with the energy of indefatigable strength and the enthusiasm of new born zeal, his political responsibilities. In the intervals of a laborious profession, and of exacting literary toil, he aspired to mould the destinies of his country. But as an active politician Burnet was hardly a success. He mistook the outlook of the political critic—the talents of the political pamphleteer—as sufficient qualification for the man of action. On certain great issues indeed Burnet was to evince a candour, a breadth, a fearlessness of judgment which few of his contemporaries could approach. As a debater, again, his copious eloquence gave him a decided status; though the vehemence of his manner and the stentorian volume of his voice excited malicious amusement within the precincts of the Upper House. But on all questions of immediate moment his intense excitability—the most fatal of flaws in a practical statesman—too frequently committed him to expedients which outraged his avowed convictions. An inveterate—a "blazing"—indiscretion rendered him the *enfant terrible* of contemporary debate. His political associates admitted

him as seldom as possible to confidences of value; and never saw him on his feet without a decided tremor. Nor was he the first journalist—he is certainly not the last—to plume himself on policies which brains more astute or more unscrupulous have dexterously employed him to popularise.

The political situation, at the time he entered the House, was calculated to excite his sympathies. The new King—(in language consecrated by Halifax, his most trusted Minister), wrote himself down "a trimmer"; he desired to transcend parties, and bring a united nation into the great coalition against France. Such a policy appealed to Burnet. He too had been branded as a moderate, a "Trimmer"—a "Jack of both sides." For hitherto a certain breadth and receptivity of temperament—a real if impulsive candour of mind—a moral fervour which could not condone the excesses of party zeal—had preserved him from the shibboleths of a faction. Halifax had been at one time his idol; he had preserved friendly relations with men of almost all sections. As the ties of party become more rigid, its antagonisms more acute, its passions more intense, we shall see him lose that relative sanity of judgment which results from width of outlook. Under pressure of political alarms —of "Jacobite" insult and "High Church" sneers—he will die an impassioned partizan. But in 1689 he would have resented, as an aspersion, the title of "Tory" or "Whig."

Yet towards the "Tory" or "Church" party his professional sympathies inclined, during the first year of the Revolution settlement; the State Secretary, Lord Nottingham, the hope of the moderate Churchmen, was the statesman in whom Burnet most confided; and to reconcile the clergy with the new economy was the leading aim of his policy. Through life he remained passionately loyal to what he thought the true interests of his adopted communion; but, even at this time, he was alienated—and with a growing alienation—by the narrow and furious bigotry which rendered so many Anglicans the unrelenting foes of Dissent. The more rigid churchmen, on their part, had long resented his extreme Erastian views and his principles of toleration. Since, moreover, as a rule, even the more moderate of the

clergy acquiesced in the new settlement at some sacrifice of sentiment, where not of principle, they had little love for a voluntary renegade from the principle of Passive Obedience.

A gulf almost wider, however, severed Burnet from the semi-republican, semi-deistical extremists to whom the cant of the moment more particularly applied the term "Whig." Erastianism—tolerance—enthusiasm for the new departure were the only points of contact between them. Burnet resented their avowed hostility to the very existence of specifically religious corporations; and no reformer who ever lived was less of a "doctrinaire." "*I do not think*" (he wrote on September 7 of this year to the Secretary of a Whig minister) "*that now when we are at quiet it is convenient to write much upon this subject of...the right of the people's defending themselves when the whole constitution is in danger of being overturned. That is a question fit to be laid to sleep; for in quiet times there is no occasion to dispute*" (*i.e. discuss*) "*it; and whensoever a new occasion is given by the violence of the government to examine it, authors and matter will be found to support it.*" To the monarchical principle we find him consistently faithful. As it was he who moved and carried the famous, if ill-drawn, amendment to the Bill of Rights which absolves the subject from allegiance to the husband of a Popish Queen; so William thought fit to entrust him with an additional clause, settling the crown in remainder on the House of Hanover. This was rejected by the Whig vote; as the result, Burnet indignantly complains, of a veiled Republican bias.

Some personal animus also existed on either side. The Whig exiles would have been more than human had they condoned his coldness when in Holland, or failed to satirize his tardy conversion to "resistance principles." Burnet, on his part, was repelled by the virulence, which had accumulated during an eight years' ostracism. He steadily refused to countenance the "Whig" legend, that Essex had been murdered in the Tower. He concurred with the majority in the Upper House which, on motives rather equitable than legal, demurred to an appeal from the perjurer Oates, the idol of Whig fanaticism. He intervened on behalf of

the new Queen's uncles, who had gone far on their brother-in-law's behalf; and of whom one at least had been personally injurious to himself. Johnson the pamphleteer, Lord Russell's former chaplain (his back scored with the wheals of the hangman's scourge), sneered bitterly at "Scotch "Doctors" that would "teach the art of forgetfulness"; who call for "*gude* memories" retentive only of "*gude* things."

Nor could Burnet count on the suffrages even of "Trimmers" like himself. The dislike of William has been mentioned. Lord Halifax, though ostensibly amicable, looked on him with some contempt. He conceived a respect for the *prelate*, and retained admiration for the *writer*; but his cruellest shafts in the Upper House were reserved for the Spiritual Peer. For Halifax had small belief in the parson-politician, and regarded with cynical amusement the divine's pretensions to statesmanship. Burnet's apparent change of front on the Non-resistance question had inspired Lord Halifax with distrust; the affair of the Crown Matrimonial had left a mutual repulsion; and the alienation deepened as Halifax drifted into opposition.

When, meanwhile, on April 3 1689, Burnet took his seat in the House of Lords no less than four questions of immediate ecclesiastical import were in suspense. The Toleration Bill, the Comprehension Bill, the bill concerning new Oaths of Allegiance, and the proposed abrogation of the Sacramental Test were all reacting one on another, all serving as pawns in the more purely political game.

By the Toleration Bill, freedom of worship was secured to all Trinitarian Protestants. Introduced by Lord Nottingham, a "Church" leader, the recent declarations of the Episcopate rendered opposition indecent, even to the more "rigid" churchmen. For Burnet it realised, of course, one of his most cherished dreams; and he tells us that as respects certain unspecified details, he stood alone among his spiritual compeers.

The question of the new Oaths aroused widespread alarm; since it was proposed *inter alia* to impose them, on pain of deprivation, upon all ecclesiastical incumbents. Now a large proportion of the Church party, and a still larger proportion of the clerical element throughout the

country, even when ready, and in some cases anxious, to *accept* the new settlement, had scruples about swearing fresh Oaths till a regular demise of the Crown. In consequence, the Bill, as Burnet tells us, was justly considered "by all "the Church party, as a design against the Church of "England. For it was then given out that the greater "part would refuse the oaths; and this [the extreme Whigs] "hoped would either quite break or divide the Church." The moderate Whigs meanwhile "hoped...to bring the matter to "such a composition, that the Church party, to save this "storm from themselves, should have consented to take "away the Sacrament Test....This would have let in "dissenters to places of trust." In pursuance of this policy, the King (three weeks before Burnet entered the House), had been unwisely induced to press for the repeal of the Test Act. Burnet in the strongest manner condemns this step; "there not being any one thing upon which "the Church party reckoned that their security depended "more than this, they became very jealous of the King "as willing to sacrifice the Church to the dissenters."

William's position was in fact totally untenable. In his controversy with James he had systematically represented the Tests as the sole security for a dominant establishment, where the king is of an alien Church; and he was himself at most an "Occasional Conformist" to the established Church of England. But this compromise rejected, "the "party" or "the Commonwealth's party" (for such at this time are Burnet's synonyms for the Whigs) turned with renewed energy to press the Bill of Oaths.

Burnet originally argued for exemption of the clergy. Sound policy indeed in his opinion forbade the government to suffer that men who considered themselves "under "another allegiance" should "minister in Holy things" within the realm. But he regarded the use of the royal style in the public ordinances of the church as a pledge of fidelity, equal in binding force to "any oaths whatsoever." Learning however during the debates that the more extreme clergy, by a subterfuge, prayed only for a nameless "King" and "Queen," he changed his attitude. Nevertheless he still favoured a *Modus vivendi*; and at the last moment, with the Royal sanction, proposed in the House of

Lords a statesmanlike solution. He suggested that the oaths should only be offered, upon an order under the Privy Seal, to such clergy as should give signs of disaffection. Harmless scruples would thus have been respected; a rod being kept in pickle for the militant Jacobite priest. The Lords accepted the amendment; the Commons threw it out; and at the "free conference" of April 22 Burnet was an active manager. The Commons dwelt on the *injustice* of differentiating between clerical officials and lay; the Lords on the *impolicy* of the ecclesiastical imposition; and on this topic "the Bishop of Salisbury" (writes a contemporary) "spoke very well." Eventually, after long debate, the Lords yielded; reserving only a proportion of their stipends to a limited number of clerical Non-jurors. "Burnet," writes a "rigid" churchman, "on this occasion behaves him-"self with more moderation and...affection to the church "than is convenient to mention here." The same informant mentions that Burnet and Tillotson had offered bail for a "Mr Collier," whose release Burnet had procured. This was probably the famous non-juror.

Burnet's anxiety now centred round his desire that the clergy should accept the inevitable. On May 13 a saintly divine, in the confidence of Lady Russell, wrote to her on the subject of the oaths, which she had urged him to take. He told her that the "monarchical principles" imbibed at "the breasts" of his "mother the University" forbade him to allow the people a power to control the succession. Some (he continued) averred a "tacit and virtual conquest." "*I* "*wish*," he proceeds, "*it had been owned to be such; for then* "*I had known, from the resolutions of civilians and casuists* "*and my own reason, what to have done.*" Lady Russell may have shown this passage to Burnet, who certainly two days later addressed to his diocesan clergy an important Pastoral Letter. Therein he warned them, by every motive of patriotism and of religion, against abandoning, on a scruple, the flocks committed to their charge. In this appeal the argument from conquest—the apostolic endorsement of the powers *that be*—holds a very prominent place; and even von Ranke fails to realise that it is purely addressed *ad homines*. Such reasoning actually satisfied, in a greater or less degree, the majority of scrupulous

consciences ; but while it was equally offensive to dynastic Legitimists and "original contract" Whigs, it was not very agreeable to national pride.

Meanwhile the Bill to "comprehend" the Presbyterian dissenters had been languidly supported. Burnet himself and its promoter, Lord Nottingham, seem to have been the only members of either House who regarded it with any enthusiasm. It contemplated a relaxation of Subscription ; a compromise on the Ordination question ; the optional use of the cross and sponsorship in Baptism, of the kneeling position at the Communion ; with a Royal Commission to review the Liturgy, the Canons, and the ecclesiastical Courts. To the Church party these concessions were extremely distasteful ; and Burnet complains of underhand obstruction, and overt vilification of the promoters. More especially did the "rigid" churchmen emphasize some preliminary conferences of Burnet and Tillotson with the heads of the dissenting interest. In extreme Whig ranks, where there was no desire that the Church should receive accessions, Burnet remarked a lethargy which filled him with disgust ; nor were the Presbyterians in love with a treaty which came thirty years too late. Burnet's zeal, however, survived these checks ; and in hopes of conciliating the clergy he voted for the appointment of a purely *clerical* Commission. He thus, as he tells us, "very much lost the "good opinion of the Whigs." Bitter experience of convocations, whereof Atterbury was the life and soul, brought him in the long run round to the Whig view. "I am," he wrote twenty years later, "now convinced, that if our church "is to be set right" it must be by a mixed Commission ; "for little good is to be expected from the synodical meetings "of the clergy ; there is so much ambition, presumption and "envy among them, that they may do much mischief" ; but can scarcely evince inclination or power to do good.

Meanwhile this concession to clerical feeling was fruitless. Ruthlessly attacked and feebly defended, the Bill was tacitly abandoned ; the House as a last resort petitioning that the King should refer the issues to *Convocation.*

Bitter was Burnet's mortification ; and here he and Halifax were at one ; for it was at the Minister's house that

Sir John Reresby met Burnet on April 14. Host and guest were in a state of extreme exasperation. The slowness of the House of Commons, the Jacobitism of the Church of England, with its hostility to the Dutch and the Dissenters; the reciprocal antipathy of the Presbyterians for the Church, and the folly of goading those from whom one expects indulgence, afforded themes for reprobation. The relegation of the question to Convocation they described as the death-blow of the scheme.

Despite a momentary depression, however, Burnet did not yet despair. His elastic spirit rose to a hope that Convocation might yet be persuaded. England had now formally joined, as Burnet had anticipated, the great coalition against France; and on June 5 was held (largely at Burnet's instance) a day of fasting and intercession for the success of our arms. Burnet, at Hampton Court, preached before the Sovereigns. The recent persecution of the Huguenots, the proceeding devastation of the Palatinate, pathetically illustrate the treatment a vanquished England must expect. In face of such terrors he pleads affectingly for ecclesiastical moderation; for leniency to reasonable, and even to some unreasonable scruples. Thus only, he urges, by becoming truly national, could the Church of England become, as she behoved, the Mother and Arbitress of Protestant Europe.

His references to the ecclesiastical situation, in a subsequent Latin letter to Van Limborch, are interesting; and we give in the Appendix the original of the passage as a specimen of Burnet's Latinity. "...Amid the bustle," he writes, "by which I am now almost overwhelmed, it is not "easy for any one to bring himself, as often as he should, to "the point of conversing, even with his friends....I rejoice "that you applaud my endeavours towards the peace of "the church, and for a lessening of the tyranny of sub-"scriptions. I have often marvelled at the effrontery with "which the Reformed Churches, to whom Ecclesiastical "Infallibility is abhorrent, can require from all their "members these forms of subscriptions; by which one "is bound to acquiesce in every proposition which has "found place in the Confession of Faith; though it is not "easy for an honest man, however devoutly set on cherish-

"ing the interests of peace, to swallow, at a gulp, a complete "system. And should there ever dawn a hope of reconcil- "ing the Churches, the plan adopted must be, not to "endeavour after unity of opinion, which cannot be expected, "but so to arrange as that such as differ in opinion may "live peaceably side by side Liberty of conscience is "already secured here by law. But as regards terms of "peace with the Nonconformists (as they are called), though "this business was carried through the Upper House some "months since, it sticks still in the Lower House; nor does "there seem a chance of it passing this Session. For it "happens, as so often falls out, that while the Noncon- "formists, hoping for more, despise the offers made them, "the stricter Conformists are equally convinced that the "terms are too generous. But we hope that the business "will be brought to a better issue next winter. As regards "the Papists, one cannot too highly applaud the mildness of "our religion and of our most merciful monarch; for even "the counsellors of King James live at large. And if any, "now and then, are imprisoned on suspicion, this is done "with such gentleness as shows that it is in their own "interest; for they are thus withdrawn and preserved from "the wrath of the people, which they have incurred and "continue to incur."

Meanwhile attention was turned to the impending session of Convocation; and on Tillotson's suggestion a purely ecclesiastical Commission had been directed to prepare a tentative scheme of the proposed conciliatory reforms. The step was in some quarters regarded as an encroachment on the freedom of Convocation. This charge Burnet denied; but he seems to have admitted (during the subsequent sittings) that "since the Act of Submission in "Henry VIII's time" Convocation could *initiate* nothing. In consequence, the terms of reference would only enable it to debate on these previously elaborated propositions, and did not cover counter proposals.

The letters patent issued September 13. They were addressed in all to twelve Bishops, of whom five had been appointed (upon regular vacancies) by the new King and Queen; and to eighteen divines, all men of some eminence. Tillotson was the moving spirit of the body; and from the

first what we may term the school of Tillotson, the so-called "Latitudinarians," had a slight superiority of number. This was increased by the immediate or eventual secession of ten among the more "rigid," or as we should say "High "Church," members. The questions before the Commission were the revision of the formularies and canons; and the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts, with the provision of facilities for the more adequate examination of ordination candidates, and for the removal of scandalous ministers. "There are," wrote Burnet to Bishop Ken on October 1, when deprecating the Nonjuror schism, "fair hopes of the "reforming of several abuses."

The Commission sat in the Jerusalem Chamber from October 3 to November 18; during which time there were 18 full sessions, from none of which, save the two first, was Burnet absent. They were principally devoted to a revision of the prayer-book; and we shall give a brief sketch of the more significant suggestions. In most of these, as was natural, the influence of the "Tillotsonians," and the desire to conciliate presbyterian prejudice are clearly discernible.

For the rubric enjoining daily service another was substituted requiring the clergy to urge on their flocks attendance at daily service; and to hold such services wherever congregations should be obtainable.

From the Calendar were expunged all "black letter" entries; and all Apocryphal lessons.

Throughout the book the "Priest" becomes the "Presbyter" or "Minister"; Sunday "the Lord's day."

The chanting of the service, in its non-lyrical portions, is forbidden.

The "Ornaments rubric" is deleted. A new rubric was proposed, commending the surplice as an "ancient and "decent habit"; but allowing Episcopal dispensations to scrupulous incumbents and congregations. This however was not endorsed; and desire was expressed for a "canon "to specify the vestments."

In the daily offices we find much minor revision of obsolete or ambiguous terms; and some attempts were made to shorten the composite service. Burnet seems to have proposed the omission of the Lessons, when Gospel and Epistle are read; but did not carry the point.

The Athanasian Creed occasioned much debate. Three courses lay open: 1. To leave it optional; 2. To omit the "damnatory clauses"; or 3. To insert an explanatory rubric. The original *introduction* of such a creed was generally regretted; but its deletion was deprecated, on account of its antiquity, the uniform practice of the Reformed Church of England, and the "offence" such a step would give. "It was "replied by the Bishop of Salisbury: 1. That the Church of "England received the four first General Councils [and] "that the Ephesine Council condemns any new Creeds. "2. That this Creed was not very ancient and the Filioque "especially. 3. That it condemned the Greek Church, "whom yet we defend." Eventually the Commission decided to restrict the use of the Creed, by confining it to the greater festivals and All Saints' Day; and to insert an explanatory rubric limiting the denunciations of the creed to such as obstinately deny the "substance of the Christian "faith." A number still strove for an optional alternative; eminent Conformists, it was said, already ignored the Creed; to the Nonconformists it was specially distasteful. Finally the responsibility was referred to Convocation; where Burnet and Tillotson promised to support its optional use.

In the Communion service the Beatitudes, with appropriate responses, were allowed to alternate with the Ten Commandments. After the Nicene Creed occurs the memorandum, which we may not improbably ascribe to Burnet's influence: "It is humbly submitted to the Con- "vocation whether a note ought not here to be added with "relation to the Greek Church, in order to our maintaining "Catholic Communion." In the rubric concerning publication a new clause (obviously suggested by the episode of the "Indulgence" Declaration), forbids announcements illegal in their tenor. The despondent are to seek, not *absolution* but "spiritual advice and comfort." A new rubric requires monthly celebration of the Eucharist in all large parishes, and a quarterly celebration at the least in all small ones; and obliges the clergy to urge frequency in Communion. Kneeling may be dispensed with, if notice be previously given of a conscientious scruple on the part of an intending communicant.

In the Baptismal Service, parents are admitted as God-

parents (or "Sureties" as the revisers preferred to call them); all "Sureties" to be communicants. The phrases implying a baptismal regeneration were retained, after considerable debate. A well-expressed rubric (drawn up, apparently, by Burnet) vindicates as an "ancient and "laudable custom" the sign of the cross in baptism; but allows episcopal dispensation in case of scrupulous consciences.

In the Catechism, the Eucharist is additionally defined as a renewal of pledges to the Redeemer; and the unique character of the Crucial Sacrifice is additionally emphasized.

To the marriage service, a notice is appended, demanding a canonical restraint of the abuses then connected with the special license system. The ring is rubrically defined as a "civil ceremony and pledge"; and the frank terms of the preface are slightly modified.

At the Visitation of the Sick, the words "upon thy "true faith and repentance" are inserted in the formula of absolution; "I absolve thee" being also changed into "I pronounce thee absolved."

A slight and dexterous alteration in the Burial Service modifies the suggestion of an indiscriminate belief in the bliss of the departed.

The Commination Service is entirely recast. The existing preface and the Deuteronomic curses are replaced by the Beatitudes, and various evangelical denunciations, with appropriate responses; and by an exhortation which we may reasonably ascribe to Burnet's pen. This dilates on the primitive idea of Lent; on its mediæval accretions; and on the conditions of a salutary fast.

The Ordination Services received much attention. As regards the examination of candidates "the Bishop of Salis- "bury told the board what was wont to be in his time in "Scotland." The question of Reordination seemed urgent. The Bishop of Sarum distinguished three separate issues. 1. The case of converts from the Roman Priesthood. 2. That of Ministers ordained in Foreign Protestant Churches. 3. That of Ministers ordained by "the Dis- "senters at home." It was queried on the first head, whether the doctrine of Intention, and the impossibility of testing the Letters of Orders adduced by professedly priestly

converts did not render reordination a necessity. With respect to foreign Presbyterians Burnet quoted the precedents of Dr Du Moulin, appointed a Prebendary of Canterbury without reordination, and of the Scotch Bishops consecrated, without reordination, under James I. At last it was proposed that persons possessing actual though imperfect orders "should be received by the imposition "of hands of the Bishop...to officiate in the Church of "England." As regards the English Dissenters, "the "Bishop of Salisbury" argued for leniency; "it was a kind "of necessity in our present circumstances, and...the ancient "church did give us some directions, when notwithstanding "the Canons of the Church against admitting two Bishops "to one Altar, yet they were willing to receive the "Donatists...though [they] had been very vexatious." A rubric was eventually agreed upon, which while maintaining episcopal ordination as the sole and constant practice of the ancient church, yet permitted, in the interests of peace, for the present occasion only, this hypothetical ordination of men Presbyterially ordained. Each party was left specifically at liberty to place his own interpretation on the words "If thou hast not been already ordained"; and this, as Burnet thought, removed all taint of equivocation.

The formula of ordination was also debated. Many wished it transformed into a prayer. Burnet argued that the actual form (uncountenanced by the "Apostolic" Constitutions, by the Carthaginian Council, or by the Areopagite Dionysius) "was not above 400 years standing "and...was brought in...when the design was to exalt the "priesthood...in Hildebrand's time." In the long and technical debate which followed the authorities Bramhall and Francis Mason were freely quoted against Burnet. "To this the Bishop of Sarum replied, it was their mistake, "and if Mr Mason had lived since Morinus published his "book, he would have made good work with it." Tillotson supported him with an appeal to Augustine *de Trinitate*; and Burnet carried the day.

Tillotson also consulted Burnet in private as to a subsidiary book of Homilies. The old one was more or less obsolete; and moreover contained—so the Jacobites spitefully hinted—a vigorous defence of "non-resistance."

Tillotson himself framed an elaborate scheme, by which Christian faith and morals should have been systematically handled, in an annual course of 72 sermons. These were to harmonize with a revised series of collects, epistles and gospels; and he would have apportioned them among various contributors, notably himself, Burnet and Patrick. A proclamation against vice and immorality suggested subjects; and during the next few months Burnet actually prepared seven discourses, first published twenty-four years later. They treat respectively of the two evangelical commandments, of the third, fourth and eighth articles of the Decalogue, of Common Swearing, and of Drunkenness. They may rank as models of simple exhortation; that on love of our neighbour is a beautiful little treatise.

The questions of Subscription and Excommunication, which specially interested Burnet, were postponed for lack of time.

Meanwhile rumours of impending change exasperated the lower clergy, already seething with discontent. Nor can this irritation surprise us. The Presbyterian King had been half a year on the throne. During that time nothing had been done in favour of the Established Church; and several measures had passed extremely obnoxious to her clergy. Meanwhile the Protestant Nonconformist bodies, all Presbyterian in form, had received Parliamentary boons. Across the Scotch border, moreover, Presbyterianism was already in possession; and the violence which accompanied the change, and was even exaggerated by rumour, intensified the alarm of the Anglican party.

The odium this excited rebounded more particularly on Burnet. "It was...thought," he tells us, "that I could "have hindered the change...in Scotland."

This charge is unfounded. Burnet, who had intervened, even in Holland, for Scotch episcopalianism, had more recently introduced to William the Dean of Glasgow, the accredited representative of the Scotch episcopate. From the first, however, Burnet was pointedly refused that influence in Scotch affairs on which Duke Hamilton and Dundee (Burnet's connection by marriage) had both prematurely relied. For the King, who had striven for at least the appearance of impartiality, had been forced by the frank Jacobitism

of the Episcopalians in Scotland, where not a Bishop took the Oaths, into the arms of the Presbyterians. A Presbyterian triumvirate at Whitehall (Benthinck, the elder Dalrymple and the Reverend William Carstares) ruled Scotland in the moderate Presbyterian interest. William urged Burnet to explain among his friends the nature of the Royal dilemma; promising—no easy task—to bridle Presbyterian passion. Burnet did his best; but his Erastian excuses for the step, and the continued intolerance of the Scotch Presbyterians "gave very bad impressions" to "the whole body of the clergy."

It was therefore not surprising that intense resentment arose at the proposal to "purge" the Liturgy in the interests of Presbyterian scruple; or that the elections for Convocation produced a majority hostile to ecclesiastical concession. The Members, late in November, came up ready for the fray; and Burnet pressed to the fore. One Dr Jane, a seceder from the Commission, "was" (writes a strong churchman) "to have preached on Sunday [afternoon] "last before the King at Whitehall... ; but the impulse was "so strong upon the Bishop of S[aru]m that he...dis-"possessed the Doctor of the pulpit." The subject of the discourse so interpolated does not appear. On November 26, however, when Burnet preached at St Lawrence Jewry, he delivered an impressive (if hardly tactful) "exhortation to "Peace and Unity" on the text "Ye are brethren."

Convocation business had begun on November 20 in Henry VIIth's Chapel. Beveridge, one of the highest churchmen who had remained on the Commission, opened proceedings with a fine Latin Sermon; wherein, while eulogizing the existing formularies of the Church, he recommended, in the name of charity, some condescension. The Lower House immediately selected Jane as prolocutor; and it was at once clear that the revision was doomed. Dissensions instantly arose between the two Houses on the subject of an address to the King; the Lower House vetoing the words "the Protestant Religion in general" lest it should "own the Presbyterian churches of the Continent." Burnet, as champion of reform, and Jane, as prolocutor, managed the ensuing conference. The Lower House proposed to accept the amendment "Protestant Churches" in place of

"Protestant Religion." Burnet for his part argued that the unqualified term "Church of England" is on its side equivocal; since the epithet, being purely local, would apply to Popery if once established in England. The existing Church of England, he maintained, might well accept the adjective "Protestant," since it is only distinguished from the other Protestant Churches by its hierarchy and revenues. Jane smartly replied that Articles, Liturgy, Homilies, are further distinguishing features; and that the phrase "Protestant Churches" is really more equivocal, since it could be stretched to include Anabaptists, Socinians and Quakers. A cool and colourless address was finally adopted; the Lower House deliberately diverged on a side issue, and in February, with the Parliament, Convocation dispersed.

Reform and Comprehension were thus scotched; and ten years were to elapse ere Convocation again met. Mortified as was Burnet, he concluded all for the best. The "rigid" Churchmen would never have acquiesced in the proposed alterations; and a schism must have been the result of success.

At St Stephen's, meanwhile, the winter session of 1689–90 had proved stormy in the extreme. Bitter complaints of unsuccessful operations in Ireland alternated with violent contests for supremacy between the extreme churchmen (or "Tories"), and their antipodes the fanatical "Whigs." These last avowedly strove (by means of the Corporation Bill, and the so-called "Murder" enquiry into the "Rye "House" prosecutions) to ostracise the Tories and Moderates. With unrelenting hostility they drove Halifax into opposition; and their clamorous virulence, as it completely alienated William, so it disgusted the nation. A dissolution became imperative; and the general election immediately ensued.

On February 22, Burnet writing to a friend gives some interesting details. "We have," he says, "nothing amongst "us now but elections which put the nation into a high "fermentation; and it is not possible yet to know which "side will prevail. Those who are called the Tories do "now declare very high for the present government...so that "it seems rather to be an animosity of parties among

"themselves, than anything in which the government is "concerned....The King's own behaviour is so very equal "that it appears he thinks himself sure of both parties." For his Majesty recommends no one; but when directly appealed to says "That he would have moderate men of "the Church party chosen." In fine, the result was a "Church" or "Tory" majority.

About a week before the meeting of the new Parliament, on occasion of a fast for the war, Burnet, at Bow Church, preached to the Court of Aldermen a remarkable sermon. His text is the evangelical narrative, wherein Christ laments over Jerusalem, as ignorant concerning her peace. Transferring the charge to the England of his own day, Burnet pictures the comparative blessings of the nation from 1558 to 1688. Even the Civil War had its alleviations; both sides, at least, so far remembered they were Englishmen that they sought no foreign aid. Other storms that threatened have "gone over us in so "inoffensive a manner" that many undervalue a deliverance from evils *seen* more than *felt*. Meanwhile the foreign Protestant Churches, fallen from their first love, drink the cup of God's wrath; and what have not we deserved? With unsparing severity he unveils the corruptions of the age; the luxury, and the injustice—the fraud, the violence, and the impieties—of which London is the seat. Forcibly he paints for us the sieges of Jerusalem and Constantinople; when a corrupt society, torn by internal dissensions, fell a facile prey to the savage rapacity of its foes. Nor are these (he warns his readers) merely "signal transaction[s]" of the centuries that are dead; rather they are a "standing "monument of the severity of the justice of God against an "impenitent...nation." What of us, who, confronted by a mighty enemy, yet revive, "with the old and once extin- "guished names, our old animosities"? He is specially severe on the relentless foes of the Church. "It was once "hoped" (he proceeds) "that all past errors had been "forgot"; and more especially and deservedly those of a party (he means the Church), which at the crisis, seeing the real tendency of certain false steps it had taken, generously retraced them, and joined in against "the "common enemy." But no. "A violent aversion and a

"mortal jealousy appears on all hands; we fancy we are "not safe from one another, and by our fancying it...render "ourselves...unsafe....Is every man" (he cries) "...soured "with the leaven of a party?...Were the wrongs done so "great that they cannot be forgiven? Are the differences "so wide that they cannot be healed? Is there no balm in "Gilead, and is there no physician there?"

This impassioned appeal was however quite fruitless. The new Parliament, when not engrossed in party recrimination, wrangled over the Revenue, and a new "Test "Oath." Despite his pacific counsels, even Burnet voted for the singularly impolitic "Abjuration Bill" initiated in the House of Lords. This would have imposed disfranchisement, official ineligibility, and double taxation, upon all adult males who should not take an oath renunciatory of King James, which was couched in terms repulsive to the conscientious Tory. It must be admitted, however, that a French invasion seemed imminent; and perhaps Burnet, in the excitement of the moment, thought the exclusion of Jacobites from trust the overwhelming need of the hour. The project fortunately collapsed, as Burnet lived to approve. For when recording, a year later, in his Memoirs, the defeat, by Royal influence, of a yet more drastic Bill introduced in the House of Commons, he calls this interposition "a wise and good resolution; though" (he adds) "I...was at that time of another mind." For if the Royal intervention "enraged the Whigs who hoped... "to have all the places of trust," yet in general "it had" (he says) "a good effect; it gained the Tories more "entirely to the King."

The Revenue question he discussed with the King himself. He thus realised how acutely William resented the *temporary* character of grants made to himself; in glaring contrast to those which had been accorded to his predecessor for life. Burnet diplomatically hinted that occasional revenues guarantee frequent Parliaments; and that a precedent seemed desirable in view of possible successors. Less appropriate was his reminder that such precautions might have saved James II from himself. William, as we learn without surprise, was not much appeased by the singularly maladroit consolation.

The prorogation took place May 20; and William announced his intention of assuming the command in Ireland. Despite Burnet's habitual want of tact the extreme dislike with which William had regarded him seems to have been on the wane. The Bishop's freedom from party entanglements, his zeal for comprehension, his obvious and single-hearted enthusiasm for the new settlement, all told in his favour. He had been moreover the channel of some useful services. Through him a Scotch informer, of high rank, had conveyed to the King intelligence of a plot which had been ignored by Benthinck, the virtual viceroy for Scotland. Through Burnet, also, an adventurer had submitted a project to kidnap King James; a scheme which Burnet approved, but William more wisely vetoed.

Further, we see reason to surmise that William appreciated Burnet's enthusiasm for the Queen, whose self-effacing loyalty (her obvious abilities notwithstanding) was thawing the coldness of her hitherto unresponsive husband. A few hours before his departure he summoned Burnet to his closet. Resolute as usual, his spirits were unusually depressed. To his wife, who was to assume (as Burnet had anxiously desired) the reins of Government in his absence, he referred with unwonted solicitude; trusting that all "who loved him would wait much on her and assist "her." He lamented the passions he left behind—passions fomented by the clergy; from which charge however he was "pleased to...except" Burnet. To the parricidal character of the campaign on which he must enter, he referred in feeling terms; and desiring Burnet's prayers dismissed him "very deeply affected."

Pursuant to these commands, Burnet remained at Windsor (then within his diocesan limits) through the whole of the anxious summer which saw the victory of the Boyne, and the naval disaster of Beachy Head. Once a week he waited on the Queen at Whitehall; and her fortitude intensified his admiration. Racked by conflicting apprehensions for husband, father, and country she preserved her self-command, and told Burnet that if forced to confront revolt or invasion she would permit him to attend her. Measures so extreme were not however required, and Burnet was free, for the first time, to grapple with diocesan problems.

The resolutions with which he had entered on his episcopate have been preserved; and reveal, like the corresponding notes of Bishop Wilberforce, an awe, a self-abasement, and a self-distrust, which almost surprise the reader.

"I am now," he says, "coming to thee again, O my God, "to be once more dedicated to thee, and to rise up to the "highest station in thy house. But how does this strike "me, when I, that am not worthy to remain in the lowest "order, but deserve to be cast out, as salt that has lost its "savour, am now to be exalted instead of being debased! "Oh but the judgments of men are slight and deceitful "things! I pass for somewhat in the world. But...I know "the corruptions of my own heart and the errors of my life, "which ought rather to drive me to a wilderness to spend "the rest of my life in mourning for what is past, than to "enter upon an employment that is but a little lower than "that of angels. I have had address enough to cover my "faults, and favourable circumstances have concurred to "hide them from the world. But they are all known to "thee, and therefore I stand trembling in thy presence, "divided in my thoughts; thy Providence seems to call me "out to this station and my guilt pulls me back....Ought "not I rather to fall down before the Bishops, as an humble "penitent to subject myself to the utmost severities of "censure, rather than suffer them to lay hands on so great "a sinner? Here I fall down before thee, O God, to be "guided by thee; for after all, how guilty soever I may be, "I still retain my integrity, and do offer myself up to thee. "All that determines me now is that thy Providence which "calls me to this station is public and visible and my sins "which pull me back are secret, and therefore it seems to be "thy will that one should be followed rather than the other. "But...thou who knows my sins knowest likewise how "bitterly I have mourned for them...and how seriously I "am resolved to change the whole course of my life, even "to the smallest particulars. I am indeed resolved to avoid "all singularities and affectations; but as I will keep sin "and all objects that may lead to it at the greatest distance, "so I will enter on a stricter course of daily devotion, and "of seeking this by secret prayer; of spending days in

"fasting and wrestling with thee as I was wont to do many "years ago." He vows to live as an example before his household, his diocese, and the world. "I will visit the "sick, relieve the poor, comfort the prisoners, and will "employ the revenue that belongs to the Church as a "trust which I am to administer, and for which I know I "must answer to thee, whose right it is....And as for this "Holy Function, into which I enter, as thou hast given me "high and sublime notions concerning it, so I will by thy "grace put all these in practice....I will not spare myself, "much less will I lose that time which now in a more "particular manner is thine, in following a Court or any "other impertinent cares....I will lay aside the prejudices "of a party, and as I will not rule over any by force or "cruelty, so I will show all kindness not only to such as "may differ from me, but even to gainsayers; for I will "love all men. I will live with my brethren of the clergy "in all brotherly love and true humility. I will not act by "my own single advice but by the concurrence of the best of "my clergy, and will do what in me lies to carry on the "Reformation of this Church to a full perfection, by cutting "off the corruptions that do still remain among us, and by "adding such things as are wanting....And I will set myself "to do the work of a Bishop in my diocese without ever "designing to remove...higher....All these are my sincere "resolutions; yet I know they will be as nothing if thou "dost not concur....Oh how often have I begun well, but, "alas, the end was afflicting! All my hope is now placed "in this, that I know I begin at thee, my God, and put "my trust wholly in thee. O let [me] feel this day some of "the motions of that wind that blows whensoever thou "pleases! Make me find both in my receiving this divine "benediction and in being admitted to the mysteries of thy "Son's death such a measure of thy grace, that I may feel "that I have a new principle within me, a seed of God by "which I may grow up to thee....Do thou but enable me to "perform my duty and then dispose of me in all other "things." Martyrdom indeed were by far the noblest portion. "But thou O God knows best what I am able to "do and to suffer; therefore...thy will be done on me and "in me....Come, Lord Jesus, even so, come quickly!"

Such was the temper in which Burnet entered his See. The failure of the Church reform project but stimulated his diocesan ardour; "I saw," he says, "no good could be done "in that...conjuncture for the dealing of our breaches, this "made me apply myself more diligently to do all the good "I could in my own diocese....And because my diocese "consist[s] of two counties, Wiltshire and Berkshire, I "resolved to divide the year between them...eight months "...at Salisbury and four at Windsor."

The Episcopal energy of Burnet has been eulogized in a well known *Character*. This is usually ascribed to his former friend, Savile, Lord Halifax; though perhaps it may be really attributable to the Halifax whose surname was Montague. Burnet (explains this essay sarcastically) "makes many enemies by setting an ill-natured example of "living which they are not inclined to follow. His indifference for preferment, his contempt not only of splendour, "but of all unnecessary plenty, his degrading himself into "the lowest and most painful duties of his calling, are such "unprelatical qualities, that, let him be never so orthodox in "other things, in these he must be a dissenter. Virtues of "such a stamp are so many heresies in the opinion of those "divines who have softened the primitive injunctions, so as "to make them suit better with the present frailty of mankind. No wonder then if they are angry, since it is in "their own defence; or that from a principle of self-preservation they should endeavour to suppress a man, whose "parts are a shame, and whose life is a scandal to them."

His methods indeed appear to have been much more energetic than those of his brother bishops, respectable as were many of these. They resemble more those initiated, a century and a half later, by another episcopal reformer, who was to rule over the Berkshire portion of Burnet's own diocese. Like Wilberforce, Burnet relied much on elaborate diocesan tours, distinct from the formal visitation. Once a year, he devoted three weeks or a month to perambulating his diocese "preaching and confirming every day from "church to church," keeping open table for his clergy, and in his earlier days holding conferences with them "upon the chief heads of Divinity." In discourses "of "about two hours length, I opened," says Burnet, "all that

"related to the head proposed, and encouraged them to "object or propose questions." Mr Tanner, incumbent of Lavington, writing to his son, the well-known antiquary (then an Oxford undergraduate), gives a pleasing glimpse of such a conference, held in 1694 at "The Devizes." A considerable company of the clergy there met the Bishop, and discussed the legal and evangelical dispensations. "He is," says Tanner, "exceedingly kind and civil to the "clergy and gave us very good treatment." Some of these discourses, when published, occasioned heated controversy. "I found," says Burnet, "the clergy were not much the "better for them, and false stories were made and believed "of what I delivered in those conferences"; and after his work on the Articles had rendered them superfluous, he abandoned them altogether.

Like Wilberforce he placed great emphasis on the rite of Confirmation. "I judged," he says, "that nothing would be "a likelier means to raise the spirit of religion (that was gene- "rally sunk and dead) than the calling on persons to be con- "firmed, not in their childhood upon their having the church "catechism by rote, but when they were come to the years "of discretion, that so by an act and sponsion of their own "they might engage themselves to Christianity. I thought "this would likewise give the clergy an opportunity of "going from house to house about their parishes, and of "enquiring into their deportment, and so entering upon "such methods of treating with them as they should find to "be most effectual. This I have observed on my part; but "it is not easy to bring the clergy to desire to take pains "among their people, nor are the people very willing to "submit to it, so this goes on but slowly."

It is certain at any rate that Burnet did his share, for he took the trouble to draw up and forward to every incumbent preliminary suggestions for the preparation of confirmation candidates.

His system was as follows. "I stay," he writes, "a "week in a place, where every morning I go and preach "and confirm in some church within six or seven mile of the "place, and then at five o'clock after evening prayer I "catechise some children, and explain the whole Catechism "to them, so that I go through it all in six days, and

"confirm there next Lord's Day, and make" a present of books "to the value of about a crown a child to all "whom I catechised, and I have them all to dine with me "on the Lord's day. This seems to be the most profitable "method I can devise both for instructing, as well as "provoking, the clergy to catechise much, and for setting a "good emulation among the younger sort to be instructed." The "youth of the two great schools" at Salisbury specially attracted his attention; and he took care to be at Salisbury every Lent, that he might catechise them in the cathedral.

At all times he was, like Wilberforce, an indefatigable preacher. Whenever in residence at Salisbury, he undertook the weekly "lecture" at the Church of St Thomas. Each Sunday evening he lectured in his own Chapel to crowded congregations, on the Epistles and Gospels; and made a point on Sunday mornings of preaching in "as many "churches as lay within such a distance that I could "decently go to them and return on a Sunday." On one occasion, at a time of high floods, his reluctance to disappoint a rural congregation nearly cost him, as his son tells us, his life. By the time he had held his bishopric fifteen months, he had preached and confirmed in fifty parishes; while when writing his autobiography in the twenty-first year of his episcopate, he could record that he had confirmed in two hundred and seventy-five churches of his diocese, having visited the more important ten or twelve times.

The due preparation of candidates for orders caused in him, as in Wilberforce, peculiar solicitude. "I looked," he says, "on Ordinations as the most important part of a "Bishop's care and that on which the law had laid no "restraints; for it was absolutely in the Bishop's power to "ordain or not as he judged a person qualified for it; and "so I resolved to take that matter to heart. I never turned "over the examining those who came to me for orders to a "Chaplain or an Archdeacon. I examined them very care-"fully myself." He always tested, in the first place, their knowledge as to Christian evidences, "the authority of the "Scriptures, and the nature of the Gospel-covenant in "Christ"; and unless satisfied on these points, refused to pass them. His intellectual standard was probably rather exacting compared with that of his day; but he complains

that even those who "could not be called ignorant...read "the Scriptures so little that they scarce knew the most "common things in them." When satisfied, however, on the point of intellectual fitness "I directed," he says, "the "rest of my discourse to their consciences and...all the "parts of the Pastoral Care." The act of Ordination "I resolved to do...with the concurrence of as great "a number of the clergy as I could gather about me, "without whose approbation and consent I resolved never "to ordain any. And this I have hitherto observed; but I "find that the strictness of my examinations frightens the "clergy so that few come to me."

As regards presentations, he had less discretion; but on more than one occasion, though threatened with a law-suit, he refused institution to a grossly ignorant presentee; and then with his usual energetic generosity prepared him for his duties himself.

His theological college at Salisbury—the scheme nearest to his heart—foreshadowed that of Wilberforce at Cuddesdon. "I thought," he says, "the greatest prejudice the Church "was under was from the ill-education of the clergy. In "the Universities they for most part lost the learning they "brought with them from schools, and learned so very little in "them that commonly they came from them less knowing "than when they went to them, especially the servitors; "who if they had not a very good capacity, and were very "well disposed of themselves, were generally neglected by "their tutors. They likewise learned the airs of vanity and "insolence at the Universities; so that I resolved to have a "nursery, at Salisbury, of students in Divinity." These were to be trained to "hard study and in a course of as "much devotion as they could be brought to" that so, as Burnet puts it, "I might have a sufficient number of "persons ready to be put in such cures as fell to my "disposing."

"I allowed them" (he says) "£30 apiece, and "during my stay at Salisbury I ordered them to come to "me once a day and then I answered such difficulties as "occurred to them in their studies, and entertained them "with some discourses, either on the speculative or practical "part of divinity, or some branch of the Pastoral Care.

"This lasted an hour, and thus I hoped to have formed "some to have served to good purpose in the Church. "Some of these have answered my expectation to the full, "and continue still labouring in the Gospel."

On the whole however the experiment, in his hands, proved a failure; for, says Burnet, the students "were not "all equally well chosen. This was considered as a present "settlement that drew a better one after it, so I was pre-"vailed on by importunity to receive some who did not "answer expectation." Moreover, like Cuddesdon, his college excited an hostility from University quarters under which, unlike Cuddesdon, it eventually succumbed. "Those "at Oxford," he writes, "looked on this as a public affront to "them, and to their way of education; so that they railed at "me, not only in secret, but in their Acts, unmercifully for it." This alludes of course to the licence of the "Terrae Filii." In fact, says Burnet, the scheme "raised such hatred against "me...and answered my expectation so little, that after I "had kept it up five year at the rate of £300 a year I saw "it was expedient to let it fall."

Meanwhile Burnet did his best to prefer men of eminence, clerical and lay. After earnest and fruitless applications in favour of Peter Allix, the learned French Protestant, who was ready to conform, he appointed him treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral. Bentley, Wotton, Colbatch, Geddes, Craig the distinguished mathematician (perhaps a cousin of his own), with many others, enjoyed his patronage; and though he deprecated Tanner's devotion to pure antiquarianism the author of the *Notitia* extols his generous assistance.

For his clergy in general, his solicitude was unceasing. Like Wilberforce he encouraged ruri-decanal meetings and clerical societies; like Wilberforce he regarded the absence of efficient discipline as one of the gravest blots on the English Church. In his own diocese he strove to grapple with the corruptions of the consistorial courts, which should he maintained "be the means of reclaiming sinners, at least "of making them ashamed of their sins...but they...think "of nothing but of squeezing...people...by all the dilatory "and fraudulent ways that are possible." He tried the effect of constant personal attendance, but found that the

"crooked" could not "be made straight." Exorbitant costs had created vested interests; and though he frequently paid them himself he was powerless to discharge fees even in vexatious suits. After some years he "gave over all "hope of doing any good in them" and relinquished attendance.

To the characteristic abuses which so long had attracted his pen—non-residence and pluralities, the sale of advowsons and the gross inequality of benefices—he now turned practical attention. His first injunctions to his archdeacons laid strong stress upon residence; and in a very acid correspondence with the Warden of All Souls, who held a living in his diocese, he rejected even academic duties as a plea for inveterate absence.

His efforts to equalise in some measure existing preferment, anticipated the aims of the Ecclesiastical Commission; and his schemes had the merit of ingenuity. "I observed," he says, "that the strength of the dissenters was in the "market towns, where the minister's provision was so "small that, according to the common observation, a poor "living had as poor a clerk. I resolved to remedy this all I "could, and there being many Prebends in the Church of "Salisbury, all in the Bishop's gift, I resolved to give these "to the ministers of the market towns, but thought it "reasonable to demand a bond of them that in case they "should leave the market town they would resign the "prebend." He had taken excellent advice; but the cry of simony, raised by his ecclesiastical adversaries, was confirmed by the learning of Stillingfleet. He gave up the bonds he had taken; and finding that many of those who had given them did not consider themselves bound in honour, he let the design fall.

He did not, however, abandon the idea of augmenting small livings. He appealed to private wealth, and supplemented it with his usual liberality. His share in the great scheme known as "Queen Anne's Bounty" will be discussed later on; and he encouraged the amalgamation of contiguous parishes when small and poorly endowed.

The engrossers of rich and scattered sinecures, however, he denounced as "robbers of the Church and as living in "a spiritual polygamy." Such remonstrances had some

effect. His son tells a pretty anecdote of his first visitation, where a severe quotation from St Bernard induced a high church pluralist to resign his second living; an act which Burnet (dispensing "poetical justice") recompensed with preferment. In general, however, such rebukes brought upon Burnet the "violent opposition" not only of actual pluralists but of "all who aspired to the like accumulation "of benefices."

From his clergy he exacted not only Sunday duty, but week-day services where even two or three would attend. It is characteristic of the man, and of his Scotch training, that he still inclined to the ecclesiastical prosecution of such persons as attended no form of public worship.

In especial Burnet claimed (and his claim is eloquently confirmed by the Jacobite Dr King, educated at Salisbury during his episcopate) that he had never yielded to the crying abuse which was becoming distinctive of the dignified clergy in England. He had not founded a family on Episcopal revenues. His children's education (even) was defrayed out of private income, and in fact their mother's fortune did not descend intact.

His charities indeed, though largely anonymous, were munificent. As was appropriate, his clergy had a first charge on them. "I set myself," he says, "to encourage my clergy "not only by my going often about among them, and by "assisting them kindly in all their concerns, but by a large "share of my income with which I have relieved their "necessities. I never renewed a lease but I gave a "considerable share of the fine either to the minister of the "parish, or, if he was well-provided, to some neighbouring "charity; so that I can reckon £3000 given by me in larger "sums among them, besides smaller ones that occur daily." The gifts to poor livings sometimes amounted to £100 at a time; while aged clergy and their widows were pensioned at his hands.

Nor was education—technical, elementary or higher—in any way neglected. He laid great emphasis on apprenticeship; and was a strong supporter of the charity school movement which was to culminate in the National Society. He frequently preached in its favour; and himself "set up "a school for fifty poor children at Salisbury who are" (he

says) "taught and clothed at my charge." Strype gives particulars. The boys were thirty in number, the girls twenty. They were taught to read, to write, to cast accounts, to say the Catechism, and to spin and card wool; so that some of the children earned 1/-, others 1/6 and 2/- per week. The cost to the Bishop was £40 a year; and Burnet acted as his own inspector. "I go" (he says) "once a month and hear ten of them repeat such Psalms "and parts of the New Testament as I prescribe; and give "them eighteenpence apiece for a reward; this is a mean "to keep them in good order." Nor did he fail to assist the University education of impecunious but promising young men.

The course of his daily life during his episcopal career is gracefully described in the pages of his son. "His time, "the only treasure of which he seemed covetous, was "employed in one regular and uniform manner. His "constant health permitted him to be an early riser; he was "seldom in bed later than five o'clock...during the summer "or than six in the winter. Private meditation took up "the two first hours and the last half-hour of the day. His "first and last appearance to his family was at the morning "and evening prayers, which were always read by himself, "though his chaplains were present. He drank his tea "[*i.e.* breakfasted] in company with his children and took "that opportunity of instructing them in religion; he went "through the Old and New Testament with them three times, "giving his own comment upon some portion of it, for an "hour every morning....This...over, he retired to his study, "where he seldom spent less than six, often more than "eight hours in a day." Rumour declared him an inveterate smoker; and caricatures are said to exist, representing him with a "Churchwarden pipe" stuck through the brim of that shovel hat, on whose breadth William had commented. "The rest of his time," continues his son, "was taken up "with business, exercise" (a point on which he held sensible views) "and necessary rest; or bestowed on friendly visits "and cheerful meals....He kept an open table, on which "there was plenty without luxury."

"You may very well remember, George" (adds the son in a private letter), "that every Sunday was solemnized at

"my father's with a huge Rump of Roast Beef and an "overgrown Plum Pudding. I remember that, once upon "a time, the cook sent in a mighty diminutive pudding, "which disrespect to the Sabbath the Bishop could not bear. "Upon examination my good friend of the kitchen said in "his excuse 'that there was no such thing as plums to be "'had.' 'Why then' (says my father) 'you should have "'made a bread pudding. For to send in such a giant-like "'Rump and such a dwarf Pudding makes a very bad "'figure, and I had rather my pudding had been a little "'worse than have so great a breach of order and "'symmetry.'"

"No man" (continues the *Life*) "was more pleased with "innocent mirth...or had a larger fund of entertainment to "contribute towards it. His equipage, like his table, was "decent and plain; and all his expenses denoted a temper "generous but not profuse. The Episcopal Palace, when "he came [there], was thought one of the worst, and when he "died was one of the best in England." Salisbury tradition does not, we may observe, endorse this estimate of his architectural efforts; while the Jacobites sarcastically observed that the *kitchen* specially profited.

The Bishop's own verdict on his episcopal exertions written at the age of 67, after an episcopate of 21 years, is touching enough. "I know I have [in my autobiography] "said that which may seem too much of my labours in my "diocese; if it were not to lay open the injustice and malice "of those angry men who studied to represent me as a "favourer of Dissenters, who was betraying the Church "into their hands." Episcopal ideals, he says (thinking perhaps of that early *Memorial*), had always engaged his attention; so he had been doubly bound to avoid "the "beaten road" and to apply himself "by the best ways" he "could think on to build up and heal the breaches of this "church." Whatever sins, therefore, humble him before God, "I do not" (he says) "know any I am guilty of with "relation to the Church; unless it be sins of omission, for "I might still have done more in every particular than "I have done. But this comfort I have, that I have studied "to put in practice the best things done by any of our "Bishops since the Reformation, and have not spared my

"person nor my purse, but have laid them out very liberally "at all times. Thus I have lived and laboured many years "and have not abated in any one particular of my first "designs, but have rather increased in them all; for at this "age both memory and strength of body are still entire."

Yet, despite these unrelaxed efforts, he doubted at the last, probably with truth, whether the external results of his labour were either great or permanent. After 21 years so spent, he describes himself as "doing little good with all "this agitation"; though as the old toiler manfully adds "since "this is the best thing I can do, I am resolved to continue "thus doing till I can see anything that is better."

The times, indeed, were less favourable than those of Wilberforce to schemes of ecclesiastical revival. The wave of ecclesiastical idealism, so potent at the Reformation, and in the ensuing "Catholic" reaction, was (as Burnet bitterly realised) fast retreating on all hands. In especial he denounced, with something of prophetic solemnity, the advances of religious unbelief, and the parochial torpor creeping over the Church of England. From scandalous vices, he thanked heaven, the clergy were in general free; but his life was made a burden by ignorance, apathy and sloth. Professional arrogance, moreover, mingled with a sordid and restless greed for "great livings, which [men] "desire to hold one upon another." And the "foul sus- "picion of simony in the disposal of most benefices (which "by a carnal and secular word are called *livings*)" seemed to him "a dreadful thing."

Nor were there wanting other hindrances to reform. Ecclesiastico-political dissensions everywhere hewed a gulf between the inferior clergy (mainly "rigid" in their Anglicanism) and an Episcopal bench which, as time went on, was more and more recruited from the moderate or Tillotsonian school. These aversions gained animus in Burnet's case on account of his supposed political apostasy; not to mention the charge of heretical tendencies, which provides so convenient a counter-blast to unwelcome reforming zeal. The clerical activity, again, which induced Wilberforce at a later date to condone some ritualistic extravagance, was in Burnet's day more usually associated with indifference to ritualistic forms. And as Wilberforce's

Romanist relations, cast, in the eyes of his opponents, a lurid light on his leniency to the extreme "High Church" men, so Burnet's Presbyterian connections pointed, for his contemporaries, the moral of his tenderness towards "scrupulous "consciences," and even towards those who lived in actual dissent.

"I was," says Burnet, "very gentle to the dissenters, "and received them kindly when they came to see me.... The "dissenters all over my diocese treated me with great respect; "they thought it due to me in gratitude, because I used them "well. They were also well pleased to see a Bishop set "himself (as they thought I did) to advance religion. Upon "this, a jealousy was taken up of me as being secretly in an "understanding with them; which the malice of some carried "so far as to give it out, that I was in a secret design to "betray the church to them; and this got such credit that "above half my clergy acted in such an opposition to me as "if they had believed it. But I resolved patiently to bear "with what I could not correct." Yet all this while (as behoved the champion of Church Establishments) "I took," he says, "much pains to convince [the Nonconformists] of "the sin and the bad consequences of separation; and I "brought many off from that way." Whole families in his diocese (so his son declares), were drawn into the communion of the church; while of two dissenting ministers (well supported when he came to Salisbury) one soon left the place, and the other found but a poor subsistence there.

And moreover, in addition to other sources of discouragement, Burnet was hampered by his own characteristic defects. Like most men of strong views, he incurred, in the first place, the charge of favouring his "creatures." Rebuke, too, of the "superior" sort comes better from a saint than from a very fallible fellow Christian. Again, Burnet obviously lacked the personal weight, the personal magnetism which marks the leader among men. With all the administrative energy of a Wilberforce, he had none of his administrative skill. With the moral aspiration of an Arnold, he had no compelling ascendancy. With the high but sane idealism, the robust common-sense of a Temple, he had none of his overwhelming power. With the wide sympathies, the extensive learning of a Stanley, he wanted

his exquisite charm. Tactless, precipitate and occasionally choleric he was perpetually at odds with his inferiors; and in an existing—and very acrimonious—correspondence with his Dean, the latter, whatever the merits of the case, has certainly the advantage in temper.

From the summary view of Burnet's diocesan activity we must turn back to October 1690, when the new King returned from Ireland bearing the laurels of the Boyne and the stigma of the Limerick failure. With his usual enterprise Burnet applied to Court friends, and even to the King himself, for details of the campaign; but his attempt to fix the onus of responsibility for certain "regrettable incidents" was met by the sovereign with a silence which would have daunted another man. Burnet was, however, almost immediately placed on a Commission of ecclesiastics, appointed to settle Church affairs in the newly-conquered island; a question as to which Burnet had expressed great solicitude. They were specially instructed to insist on the obligation of *residence*; a point on which the Queen felt strongly.

The state of feeling elicited by the events of the year is illustrated in a letter written by Burnet (soon after the commencement of the Session) to that energetic "Revolu-"tion" agent, his cousin, James Johnston, at this time envoy to Brandenburg; it is dated London, October $\frac{14}{24}$, 1690.

"I have been now," he says, "a week in town, and have "had leisure and opportunities to inform myself of our "affairs and of the temper of people's minds among us; and "I must freely own to you, that I was never more surprised "in my whole life than I am to see the House of Commons "in such a temper. All that I know say plainly, they dare "not go back into their country if they do not give money "liberally; so they have already voted above four millions.... "In a word, the French fleet, by lying so long on our coast, "as it then did us no harm[1], so now produces such effects "as if we had brought them thither; since it has both "united and animated the nation to a degree beyond "anything that the most sanguine could ever have promised "themselves. And the King's behaviour in Ireland, as "well as King James his meanness, has made so wonderful

[1] Save the burning of a fishing village.

"a change in all men's minds with relation to them both, "that we seem now not to be the same people that we were "a year ago...."

The question of immediate urgency and that on which Burnet's chief anxiety centred was the attitude of the Government to the still suspended Bishops. Burnet, as we have seen, was himself passionately desirous to avert a definite schism, and his own relations with the non-juring clergy of his diocese appear to have been on the whole amicable. Of the five within his jurisdiction who refused the oaths, four belonged to the moderate and reluctant school which contented itself with a tacit protest against the new settlement; and of these one retained his living till his death in 1694, the equivalent of his prebend being paid him from the Bishop's purse. A second was suffered to occupy his prebendal stall a year after it was legally forfeited, and continued to serve his cure by means of a curate. The third had leave to nominate his own successor; the fourth, who did not long survive, received, in the interval, "all possible regard." With the fifth, however, who represented the militant "Jacobite" section of the non-juring party, Burnet was soon at daggers drawn; but to this we shall refer later on.

For the nine non-juring prelates, meanwhile, Burnet entertained a respect which was not unmingled with admiration; since five of these had ranked among the famous "Seven," who had "passively" resisted James II. We are aware of Burnet's efforts, during the summer of 1689, to secure a compromise; and when it seemed certain that these must prove abortive, we find him ruefully bewailing the obstinacy of the Reverend Fathers in a Latin epistle to Van Limborch. We observe, with real amusement, the dignified reprobation which Burnet now accords to doctrines which he had himself so recently held.

"As for the Bishops" (he had written) "who are so "much in love with slavery that they will not suffer men's "necks to be withdrawn from the yoke, the case is lament-"able indeed. For they are men of extraordinary worth in "all that concerns true piety, sound learning, and firmness "in time of affliction. But with what pertaineth to matters "of State, and secular affairs, they are, I confess, less

"conversant. For they have such reverence for the Royal "Authority (as derived from and vicarial to God, and to "him alone responsible), that there is little hope of con- "verting them from an error no less fatal to our interest "than to theirs."

A month later (when they had incurred the preliminary "suspension") Burnet seems to have accepted what Dean Plumptre calls a "roving Commission" to act as Commissary for such of the Bishops as held sees marching with his own. Dr Frampton of Gloucester, and the saintly Ken of Bath and Wells are specially mentioned in this connection; and Burnet plumed himself on the respectful deference he had displayed for those "two Reverend "Persons," whom he esteemed, despite his difference in views, "for what is truly valuable in them." On October 1, 1689, he had written to Ken, describing himself as Ken's delegate, pledged to carry out his "orders"; and had taken the occasion to evince his deep regret at finding his Lordship "so unhappily possessed with that which is likely "to prove so fatal to the Church, if we are deprived of one "that has served it with so much honour as you have "done....I pray God" (he had pathetically added) "[to] "prevent a new breach in a church which has suffered so "severely under the old one" of 1662; especially at a moment when the impending Commission gave, as Burnet conceived, good hopes of initiating some sorely needed reforms.

So far, so good; but Burnet, as too often happened, had proceeded to spoil a really appropriate appeal by a gross absence of tact. Not only did he touch on more or less authenticated rumours, which had credited Ken with some oscillation on the point; but he had added, that the coincidence of Ken's final decision with the date of a visit to London "gave great advantages to those who were "so severe as to say, that there was something else than "conscience at the bottom."

Even the proverbial "patience of a saint" could not brook this clumsy affront; and Ken replied in terms of drastic sarcasm. He had, so he owned, experienced some vacillation, and had prepared a paper of reasons, as prelude to a possible change of front. For he had (as he pointedly

observes) been "scandalized at many persons of our own "coat, who for several years...preached up passive obedience "to a much greater height than ever I did...and on a sudden, "without the least acknowledgement of their past error, "preached and acted quite the contrary." He confesses an inability to conceive what "particular passion of corrupt "nature" can induce a decision ruinous to those concerned; and fears such reproaches may recoil on their authors. He thinks the peace of the Church will be best secured by compassionating and supporting "her sister of "Scotland"; and prays God to make Burnet an instrument of peace and charity, though Ken himself can only assist that good work by prayers against "schism and sacrilege."

This little passage of arms explains the rather faint praise with which the *History of my own Time* pays tribute to the excellent Ken.

Meanwhile the Government was straining every nerve to secure a *modus vivendi*. During the summer of 1690 the Queen had entrusted to Burnet an important negotiation. If he could procure from the Bishops an assurance of their tacit acquiescence in the new settlement, and resumption of their functions under it, a bill would be drafted to exempt them from the oaths. Burnet, aware that he was himself no acceptable intermediary, conferred with the Bishops' confidants. But the Bishops regarded the powers that were as the accursed thing; and definitely declined the overture. Early in the following spring (1691) the discovery of intercourse between certain of these Bishops and the exiled Court of St Germains brought matters to a head; it was resolved to "deprive" the hitherto "suspended" Bishops, and appoint to their Sees.

The opposite difficulty confronted Burnet himself in the economy of his own See. The sole representative of aggressive Jacobitism among his clergy was Dr Beach, a wealthy and well-born divine, of good character and some learning. He had obstinately refused to relinquish his living when so required; and stormy interviews took place at the Episcopal Palace, during which Burnet, it is clear, completely lost his temper. On April 6, 1691, Burnet wrote to the Attorney-General. He described Beach as a "pest to the country" and as likely to "wear out" the

new presentee. He charged him with omitting from the Liturgy prayers for the Sovereigns—with traducing them to his parishioners—and with insolent disrespect to his Ordinary; and begged that he might be called before the Council as one notoriously disaffected. Nay, if we may credit Beach, the Bishop went even further; and actually employed agents to collect evidence against the recusant. At length (on the charge, apparently, of seditious language), Beach was arrested; and though released on bail, was eventually convicted at Salisbury, on the evidence of a single witness, during Lent Term 1691–2.

Meanwhile, Burnet's real end had been attained; for the new incumbent, immediately upon Beach's arrest, had, after a slight scuffle, received induction. Burnet therefore sent a kind message, offering to "rescue" Beach from further prosecution. For this "no less generous than "acceptable" offer, he received grateful thanks; and an implied undertaking to keep the peace in future. Hereupon he exerted his influence for the stay of proceedings. The Government, however, demanded a public submission, which Beach declined; and as Burnet refused to intervene further, Beach, through Tory friends, obtained a *Nolle prosequi*. He settled at Salisbury; and with Burnet's connivance, held services in his own house. He continued to abuse Burnet in rancorous terms; Jacobite friends rushed into print on his behalf; and a violent controversy ensued, of which echoes may be caught some half a century later.

Turning again, however, to the general question, it now remained to be seen whether the King, in supplying the vacant Sees, would attempt to conciliate the extreme Church party or would fall back on Tillotsonian moderates. The dilemma was hardly an open one; for "rigid" Churchmen in general would have declined (as did Beveridge) to accept Sees made vacant on a secular quarrel. Great was Burnet's relief when the appointments were gazetted; for they were such as he would himself have desired. Tillotson, with unfeigned reluctance, for his health was failing and his temper pacific to a fault, was raised to the invidious eminence whence Sancroft perforce descended. Political differences at a subsequent date affected Burnet's estimate

of Sharp, who had been raised to the metropolitan chair of York; but on the whole he concludes "in two years time "the King has made fifteen bishops; and excepting what is "to be said as to myself, it is visible that they are the "worthiest and learnedest men, the best preachers, and the "men of the gentlest and prudentest tempers that could be "found....It was also observed that these were men not "past fifty, whereas generally men had not been promoted "formerly till their strength and parts began to sink with "age." The subsidiary appointments gave him equal pleasure; the King, he felt, stood committed to ecclesiastical moderation; "for he had made now so many good and "moderate Bishops that he had rendered it impracticable "to think of violent and high counsels, for want of proper "instruments."

Meanwhile, in Scotland, the course of Church affairs brought to Burnet bitter disappointment. The legal establishment of Presbytery he knew to be inevitable; and though, in previous writings, he had more than once described episcopacy as of "Right Divine," in practice he regarded acquiescence in the new order as preferable to a National Schism. He is said, on somewhat dubious evidence, to have advised the acceptance of Presbyterian orders by Scotch aspirants for the ministry; and as he had formerly striven for the comprehension of moderate Presbyterians within the limits of an Episcopal Church, so he now laboured for the retention of moderate Episcopalians within the bounds of a Presbyterian Establishment. But the intolerant spirits of the Presbyterian leaders mortified and repelled him the warm-hearted Erastian. In a letter (of which we only possess a summary, in parts obviously incorrect), he inveighs against the furious temper of the Scottish Presbyterians and their continual acts of violence against the Episcopal clergy; which, as he apprehended, would engage the English nation to re-establish episcopacy in Scotland at the earliest opportunity. And in his letter of October $\frac{14}{24}$, 1690, to his cousin Johnston, a professed, if not a very orthodox, Presbyterian, Burnet laments that "the Presbytery of Scotland proceeds with so blind a "fury that...they will raise a flame here, which may "obstruct the King's business in England, and may very

"much increase the animosities that are among us." His Memoirs, again (brought up to date August 1691), record his erroneous impression that the "heat and folly" of the Presbyterians had more "effectually weaned" Scotland "from the fondness it had to their government" than "all that had been done against Presbytery in a course "of many years." All that Burnet could do, he did. He exerted himself to procure preferment in Ulster for the dispossessed Episcopal clergy; and started a private collection in his diocese on their behalf, in which his clergy refused to concur because it was not official. Had it been so, however, it would at once have assumed undue political importance.

Two tasks meanwhile confronted the harassed Ministry for Scotland. The violence of extreme Presbyterianism had to be curbed; the Highlanders (in general "Jacobite" and Episcopal where not Papistical) had to be reduced. Under the patronage of the Scoto-Dutch group which ruled Scotland from Whitehall, the Master of Stair became Secretary for Scotland, charged with this double duty. His Highland policy involved, as it were alternatively, the methods of bribery and blandishment on the one hand—on the other the cruel old expedient "letters of fire and "sword." The last as the more drastic appealed to the callous Secretary; who regarded the Highlands much as some American officials have regarded the Indian reserves. But the Highlanders prudently succumbed; and the treachery with which, in February 1692, Dalrymple wreaked his own disappointment, and the malice of a Highland confederate, on the Macdonalds of Glencoe, is a matter of terrible notoriety. The tragedy was for months a mere rumour, save to those immediately concerned; and during this interval, as a sop to Presbyterian discontent, James Johnston, Burnet's cousin, became Dalrymple's co-secretary. Through him Burnet secured some insight into Scottish affairs, and a slight degree of influence over them.

Meanwhile, the summer of 1691 had been signalized by the complete subjugation of Ireland; and on November 26 Burnet, at Whitehall, had preached the Thanksgiving Sermon.

The enthusiasm of the preceding year was now on the

wane. The termination of the Irish war lessened the pressure of national anxiety. It rendered men—the Tories more especially—less keen on the European coalition—more sensible of the enormous drain it entailed on the national resources; more inclined to purely naval operations—more jealous of the continental King. The Whigs on their part resented his dictatorial temper and avowed preference for the Tories; while the whole nation smarted under his sullen discourtesy and predilection for all things Dutch. In the army, Churchill, now Lord Marlborough, important through his military exploits and his wife's influence over Princess Anne, and alienated by the belief that his services had been scantily requited, entered into secret intercourse with St Germain; and, in public, made himself the mouthpiece of discontent. The Session of 1691–2 gave the Court extreme trouble; and "about the end" the King, with startling suddenness, "called for Marlborough's commissions and dismissed him "out of his service."

The disgust with which Burnet in 1688 had regarded Churchill's perfidy (a disgust, we may notice, very generally shared), had by now but little abated. During 1691, while recording in his Memoirs Marlborough's plea of justification, and acknowledging his ability, Burnet had described him as self-interested and grasping; and had referred to his wife's domination over the Princess Anne in terms decidedly sarcastic. On the subject of Marlborough's dismissal the comments of his Memoirs (under date September 1693) are very explicit. "The King said to myself "upon it, that he had very good reason to believe that he "had made his peace with King James, and was engaged "in a correspondence with France. It is certain he was "doing all he could to set on a faction in the army and "nation against the Dutch, and to lessen the King; [and "that he] as well as his wife who...seemed to be the "mistress of her whole heart and thoughts, were alienating "[the princess] both from the King and Queen. The "queen had taken all possible methods to gain her sister... "except the purchasing her favourite, which she thought "below her to do." Affection for Lady Marlborough, however, "being the strongest passion in the princess's breast,

"all other ways proved ineffectual, so a visible coolness "grew between the sisters....Upon Marlborough's disgrace "his wife was ordered to leave the Court; this the princess "resented so highly that she left the Court likewise...and "the distance between the sisters is now risen" to its height.

With 1692 came a summer of intense apprehension. A projected French invasion, timed to concur with a Jacobite rising in England, was heralded by a singularly injudicious proclamation on the part of the exiled King: and the names of Burnet and Tillotson appear in the extensive list of those specifically excepted from pardon. Such reiterated proscription naturally intensified the anti-Jacobite fervour of the proscribed.

On May 24, meanwhile, our countrymen, in the great naval action off La Hogue, frustrated the scheme of France. The Queen desired Burnet to prepare a Thanksgiving Sermon; and suggested as a topic, the Israelites at the Red Sea. Such a sermon he actually sketched; and though, by his own wish, another preacher was substituted—since Burnet, who had already preached two Thanksgiving Sermons, feared the post might seem a-begging—he included the discourse in a subsequently published volume. It is highly significant. The passionate dread of a French or Irish invasion tinges nearly every line; and for the first time we trace an almost vindictive animosity against the Jacobite allies of the foreigners.

Nor was Burnet's "Revolution" ardour lessened by the evidence which suggested, rightly or wrongly, that James II had been the accomplice of Grandval's murder plot against William.

Meanwhile, a more personal topic had evoked one of his finest efforts. The death of the saintly Boyle, the "father of modern chemistry," became early in 1692 the text of a celebrated discourse. This embodies the preacher's attitude towards that "experimental" science, of which he was himself a somewhat desultory devotee. Boyle is to him one who had "joined two things, that how "much soever they may seem related, yet have been found "so seldom together that the world has been tempted to "think them inconsistent." For in him had been seen "a

"constant looking into nature and a yet more constant "study of religion," either reacting on the other. With great cogency Burnet elaborates the materialistic conclusions suggested by the dependence of mental on mechanical and biological function. But with a metaphysical acumen such as he rarely displays, he dilates on the idealistic reverse of the materialistic medal. "The flight and "compass" of a self-conscious intellect; "...the vast crowd "of figures that lie in a very narrow corner of the brain... "the strange reaches of the mind in abstracted speculations, "and the amazing progress that is made from some simple "truths into theories that are the admiration...of the "thinking part of mankind; the sagacity of apprehending "and judging...and which is above all the strength that a "few thoughts do spread into the mind by which it is made "capable of doing or suffering the hardest things"; all this is transcendent, and on purely mechanical principles, incomprehensible. Upon the fascination of intellectual adventure the preacher is singularly happy. "He," says Burnet, "who is upon the true scent of real and useful "knowledge has always some great thing or other in "prospect." And though the intellectual ascent but reveals more clearly "the weakness of our short-sighted powers" and throws difficulties into relief which simplicity ignores, even here is compensation. It is "a real pleasure to a "searcher after Truth—to be undeceived."

At this moment, moreover, a far more exacting task was on Burnet's literary anvil. During the winter of 1691 the Queen had been studying with peculiar interest, some work of the Bishop's which we are not able to identify; and had joined with Tillotson in urging Burnet to undertake a manual on the Pastoral Care. The Bishop accepted with alacrity so congenial a suggestion; and about the end of March 1692 must have written to Tillotson, announcing the birth of twin daughters and the completion of the proposed manuscript. Tillotson returns his congratulations in one of the wise and gracious letters which explain, better than his now wearisome sermons, the source of his contemporary influence. "I do heartily "congratulate with your Lordship the birth of your two "daughters and especially the safety of the good mother....

"I find your Lordship hath been in travail too, and I doubt "not but have brought forth a man-child. I shall be glad "to see him. I wonder you can have any dispute where "to dedicate it. Not that I should not be proud of it. "But nobody must come in competition with the good "Queen, who so well deserves all the respect that can be "paid her...besides that I have a curiosity to see the skill "of your pen on so tender a point, as it will be to do her "Majesty right without grating upon her modesty." On April 12 Tillotson wrote again, highly applauding the manuscript. "I saw no reason to make any alteration in the whole, "saving the putting in of one word, and the changing of "another; so moderately have I used that unlimited power "you entrusted me with. The work is...perfect in its "kind....It will I hope do much good at present, and much "more when you and I are dead and gone. I pray God to "reward you for it. On Friday last I left it with the "Queen to whom I read the Conclusion, which she will "by no means allow; nor anything more than a bare "Dedication. She says, she knows you can use no "moderation in speaking of her. So resolute and "unaffected a modesty I never saw." Burnet had of course to yield; and the existing Dedication is chastened, as 17th century dedications go.

The book was licensed May 5, 1692; and must have appeared soon after. Tillotson's eulogy of the work—which Burnet too, with an acumen rare in authors, preferred to his other writings—is not overstrained. Simple, fervent, and sincere, the passionate solicitude of the author for the reform of the pastoral ideal lends force and unity to the whole. It points with pathetic intensity the supreme convictions of his life; and every sentence glows with an ardour of spiritual fire.

A brief but admirable sketch of the mediaeval corruptions which had dimmed the primitive ideals, and of their resuscitation by Protestant enthusiasm, leads us to the gradual slackening of Protestant zeal, and to the recrudescence of clerical energy in the Romanist Counter-Reformation. When we remember that Burnet was above all things the champion of the Reformation, the courageous candour of this section is specially remarkable. Nor is clerical

sloth, in his eyes, less responsible for the "Atheism and "Impiety" so rapidly gaining ground. For Burnet sees "a circulation" in the "general corruption of nations." Ages of ignorant brutality beget eras of idolatrous superstition; these give birth to the austerity of a fanatic zeal, the source of hypocrisy; and religious cant, especially in the clergy, leads to a sceptical reaction. For clerical corruption persuades the world (to Burnet's own knowledge) that the very apologists of the faith do not really hold the doctrines, which they profess merely for hire. Moreover (urges Burnet), the due performance of clerical duty will raise the status of the ministry. Men will be ashamed to haggle over the pittance then too often grudged—sometimes even withheld—by some (the Quakers) out of principle; "by others out of downright and undisguised "sacrilege." Such reforms, again, would go far to convert the Dissenters; who will not yield to mere boasts "that the Church of England is the...best...Church in the "world."

Burnet next rapidly sketches the original aims of the Christian pastorate, drawing largely on Gregory of Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Jerome. In the same section we find an interesting biographical reference to the counsels of Charteris. Burnet then proceeds to attack existing clerical abuses, and is specially severe upon the Act of Parliament [21 Henry VIII] on which pluralists relied. No Act of Parliament can override a moral obligation; the Ordination Service—(subsequently issued)—with its allusions to residence, practically repeats the Act; and in any case, those stricter churchmen who "seem to have a particular "jealousy of the Civil Power's breaking in too far upon "the Ecclesiastical authority" can hardly plead statutes against the voice of the Church. That voice, as far as the Church of England is concerned, Burnet finds in her public offices; which seem to him more cogent in their clerical exhortations than those of any church, in any age. In language of concentrated scorn, he lashes those who, while ridiculing as "enthusiastical" the idea of a divine vocation, will give an affirmative answer to the demands of the Ordination Service. "They come to Christ" (he says) "for the loaves...therefore they will say anything for

"qualifying them to this." In forcible terms he portrays the misery of one tied for life to a profession secretly loathed; and the happiness of the Good Pastor absorbed in congenial duties.

As regards preparation for orders it is, he says, of two kinds; that of heart and soul; that of intellect. The former ranks as the more indispensable; since a good man, moderately endowed but suitably employed, may do great service; "whereas unsanctified knowledge puffs up." As handbooks for the Ordination student, he recommends the *Offices*, philosophical treatises and *Consolations* of Cicero; —the Latin Satirists, who teach detestation of vice;—the Moralists, Hieracles, Plutarch, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. As respects Christian ethics he commends [Allestree's] *Whole Duty of Man*, then still anonymous; the works of Sherlock and Scott; and "one small book "more, which is to me ever new and fresh, gives always "good thoughts and a noble temper, *Thomas à Kempis of "the Imitation of Christ.*" As biblical commentators he suggests Grotius, and Hammond, Lightfoot, Pearson, Barrow, Towerson, Patrick; and two or three doctrinal synopses. The student should choose such as represent different standpoints (Turretin, perhaps, for the Calvinistic hypothesis, Van Limborch for the Arminian, the *Theses* of Saumur for the Via Media); and "use his own reason" by balancing the various views. For the Atheistic and Deistic controversies he suggests Wilkins, Grotius on *The Truth of the Christian Religion*, Stillingfleet's *Origines Sacræ*. As practical teachers he prefers Sanderson, Farringdon, Barrow and Hammond.

Turning next to the labours of the ordained he opines that to the true pastor "his friends and his garden ought "to be his chief diversions, as his study and his parish ought "to be his chief employment." Intellectual improvement indeed is too often hindered by a cruel poverty, which interdicts the acquisition of books. Burnet points out however that in not a few parishes, Jewel's *Works* and the *Book of Martyrs* (which "lie tearing" in the Churches) might well be utilised for purposes of study. To those more happily circumstanced he proposes the *Apologies* and *Epistles* of the Fathers; the *Sermons* of Basil and

Chrysostom; History, English, Ecclesiastical, Jewish, Greek, and Roman. The classics and Buchanan (though the "sorrows of our childhood") are yet "among the best "of books"; and medical studies are invaluable to the country parson.

As regards his liturgical duties "an inward and feeling "sense of those things that are prayed for," will induce a gravity, slowness and emphasis equally remote from the "theatrical way" of Rome, and the perfunctoriness which so often brought against the services of the English Church the charge of formality.

Respecting excommunication Burnet neatly observes, that the avowed deficiency of the Church of England as respects "godly discipline," is consistent with actual authority for a good deal more than is ever put in practice; and hints that men will scarcely enlarge the sphere of clerical censure, while administered by the corrupt Courts Christian. His theory, that a deathbed repentance gives no claim to the evangelical promises, is here qualified by the suggestion that the uncovenanted mercies in Christ may avail "*at least to the lessening* [*the sinner's*] *misery in another* "*state.*" He writes sensibly of hypochondriac penitents, common in town, the victims of "an inactive course of "life, in which their minds work too much, because their "bodies" work too little. Medical advice and cheerful society will do more for these than spiritual exhortations.

Next follows a chapter on preaching. This is in effect an admirable little essay on "extempore" eloquence, which might be commended, in the interests of a long-suffering laity, to most parsons who "preach without "book."—"A preacher," says Burnet, "is to fancy himself "in the room of the most unlearned man in his...parish." Yet those that have talent must improve it; the orators, in especial Demosthenes, will repay careful study. He advises those who cannot preach well to read other men's sermons—*without acknowledgment.*

In fine (with a modesty amusing enough when we recall 1666) he excuses himself from dilating on the function of *Bishops*; having "been too few years in the "higher order to...teach them from whom I shall ever "be ready to learn." But he cannot conclude without a

touching tribute to Leighton, from whom he had derived the ideals which had been, he says, the "chief subject of "my thoughts for above thirty years."

As regards the results of the work Burnet could "thank "God" it had "had a good effect on many persons." Nevertheless, as he sardonically observes, "it helped not a "little to heighten the indignation of bad clergymen against "me; they looked on it as writ on design to expose them "to the nation; for reformation and moderation are the "two things that bad clergymen hate the most." Nor was the odium which he thus incurred otherwise than enhanced by puritanical proclamations against drunkenness and Sabbath-breach issued in the Royal name during the spring of 1692. These, as a Tory annotator sarcastically hinted, "savour[ed] so much of John Knox's doctrines and "practice, that Burnet was thought to have been the chief "contriver."

It is in fact during the year 1693 that we first perceive in Burnet's Memoirs and correspondence traces of the passionate detestation with which the "rigid" clerical majority regarded the new or "moderate" school which almost monopolized preferment. We may instance the enthusiastic (Latin) letter in which Burnet (with apologies for some years silence, during which leisure and means of communication have never seemed to coincide[1]) greets Van Limborch's Latin *History of the Inquisition* and its appreciative dedication to Tillotson.—"While we yet "discussed the subject," he says, "you were designing a "short treatise, or a long introduction, animadverting on "the zealous spirit which breathes fire and slaughter and "tracing its progress. But as in all things you far "transcend the hopes even of your friends, you have now "favoured us with an entire volume, which leaves nothing "unsaid....God grant your success may be proportionate. "It is a scandal that so many among the Reformed, who "are always, and justly, taxing the Church of Rome with "cruelty, should act in the very same spirit whenever they "have the power. They do not see, or they will not acknow-"ledge, that the Papists, who claim Infallibility, are less

[1] During the war, it must be remembered, communication with the Continent was irregular.

"guilty and more consistent in their fury than those who, "if you take them at their word, admit themselves liable to "error. Judged by their deeds, however, they claim the "power of deciding and pronouncing what must be believed. "The book is a worthy successor to those with which you "have hitherto favoured the world, and is dedicated to one "worthy of the honour; one naturally mild, and so far "edified by the spirit of the Gospel that he seems born to "heal the wounds of our Church, and its divisions. But "theological rancour bears sway on every hand; and "masked by a show of zeal deceives some and carries away "many; so that hardly, or not even hardly, dare we "prophesy smooth things concerning the Church's peace. "The French refugees among us, desperate as is their "condition, seem as mad as they do with you. Some "restraint has been put on them. Their quarrels however "are not yet composed; they were too deeply rooted. "Some in the pulpit[1] have ranked it among the marks of a "heretic that he is wonderfully anxious about morality and "good life. Blessed heretics are they, and truly Catholic, "who are informed by such a spirit. But I restrain "myself, remembering whom I address." Nine months later he returns to the charge: "What you say concerning "the ruin of Christendom, the violence of party spirit, and "the mad rage of zealots is true, alas, too true! Few there "be that either perceive or understand the spirit and ends "of our religion. The rest think it hard to put off sinful "lusts, and transform ill habits into better; to tear the "affections from things of earth, and lift up their hearts to "the City which is on high. For though these are the "grand interests of our religion few lay their necks to this "yoke. Other things therefore are sought, by which the "Powers above may be appeased, and men beguiled. "Among these, zeal for pure faith and doctrine ranks so "high, that under this mask anything may be done without "detection or at least with impunity. Nor can any salve be "found for this ill, until the Churches are possessed by "quite a new spirit; since now for the most part they are "Christian in name only."

[1] Or, in talk (pro concione). The author is indebted to Dr Gee for the sense of this somewhat obscure passage.

The passions to which Burnet here alludes had been fanned from many quarters. The Session of 1692–3 had proved exceptionally stormy. Heavy as were the war taxes, the Treasury reaped a meagre harvest; fraud and mismanagement being held accountable for the deficit. The King's unpopularity increased as rapidly as did hatred of the Dutch; which the Steinkirk disaster intensified almost to frenzy. As William still remained faithful to the custom of what we should now call coalition ministries, the permanent antagonism of Whig and Tory complicated in Council as in Parliament the quarrel of the Ins and Outs. When we add to these causes of dissension, the constant struggle between Lords and Commons, and the perpetual recrimination between professional seamen and civilian Secretaries of State (who took the place of the modern War-office as the scape-goat of national discontent) we realise something of the rancorous vituperation which seemed the atmosphere of the hour.

Through all however, thanks to bribery direct or indirect, the Government majority in the Lower House was attaining enormous proportions. The opposition, though split into factions, at length managed to unite in a combined attack on the majority. A Place Bill was accordingly introduced; framed so as to exclude from Parliament any member taking Government employ.

Parliamentary corruption was a topic on which Burnet felt so strongly that he had even ventured to remonstrate with William himself. He saw however that the Bill must cleave a gulf between the Executive and the Lower House; so he no doubt assisted to defeat the Bill in the Upper House.

Per contra he applauded the Triennial Bill, which required a General Election every three years; for long-lived Parliaments (so Burnet argued) grow necessarily factious or venal. Moreover he hoped that frequent elections would render men less eager to debauch the constituencies; and would give the latter a hold upon the conduct of their Parliamentary representatives. It is less clear what he thought of the clause determining the sitting Parliament; which was indeed the kernel of the measure to its promotors. William, recognising their tactics, calmly vetoed the Bill.

This Session also saw the birth of a National Debt. Swift, who abhorred both the system and the Bishop, made the latter responsible for the former. But financiers like Montague and Godolphin did not, as Macaulay puts it, stand in need of a tyro's advice.

Meanwhile the passions of the hour had brought upon Burnet a very personal mortification. A curious intrigue, elaborately investigated by Macaulay, brought the licenser of books into conflict with the House of Commons. He had given his *imprimatur* to a high "Tory" work (written, says Burnet, with "great modesty and judgment"), which justified the existing settlement on the plea of *conquest*. In his defence, he adduced previous works equally explicit on the topic; Burnet's first *Pastoral Letter* being among the number. A half-insane member (who, at odds with the Queen, hated Burnet as her supposed confidant), pressed the point vehemently home, and the passions of the House were excited. Only an intervening Act of Grace hindered a summons to the bar of the House; indeed one extreme Whig would have impeached him, and forced him to plead the pardon. But he had doughty champions; Montague, leader of the Whigs, and Finch, a strong Tory, combined in his defence, and the debate was duly adjourned. On its resumption the fate of his *Letter* was settled by a bad pun. A facetious member ejaculated "Burn-it! Burn-it!"; and a motion to that effect passed by 162 to 155.

Presumably Burnet applied for the protection of his own House; and alternatively for leave to defend himself at the Commons' bar. A Whig opponent hereupon sarcastically replied, that his Right Reverend Brother was welcome to be "tossed in a blanket." Burnet rhetorically appealed to the judgment of the Great Assize; and Halifax with a cruel elaboration which convulsed even William with laughter, reminded the prelate that he could claim no seat on *that* bench. Bishop Patrick meanwhile strongly supported his colleague; and described the argument from conquest as the most effective solvent of scruples. But nothing could mollify the Lower House. On January 25 the *Pastoral Letter* was burnt by the common hangman.

As was natural, it seems to have been instantly reprinted. Burnet's complaints of the usage he had received were

meanwhile loud and public; and he promptly reissued, with a new defensive *Preface*, the *Enquiry into the Measures of Submission*. In his final *History*, as Macaulay has remarked, Burnet glides over this incident as one too inconsiderable for mention. In his original Memoirs, however, he gives full rein to his vexation; with the surprising comment "it "looked somewhat extraordinary that I, who perhaps was "the greatest assertor of public liberty *from my first setting* "*out*, of any writer in the age, should be so severely treated "as an enemy to it." But (so moralizes Burnet) "the "truth was the Tories never liked me; and the Whigs "hated me because I went not into their notions and "passions."—"I find," he appends elsewhere, "the high sort "of Churchmen cannot be gained till the toleration is broke "and a persecution of dissenters is set on foot...and yet by "the pains I take to gain upon that party I have fallen "under the displeasure of the other party; so hard a thing it "is" (he adds, in language curiously reminiscent of Halifax himself) "in such divided times to resolve to be of no "parties; for a man of that temper is protected by none and "pushed at by...many....But even this" (he magnanimously concludes) "and worse things that may happen to me "shall not, I hope, be able to make me depart from "moderate principles, and the just asserting the liberty of "mankind."

The King, like Burnet, still clung to a "Trimming" policy and the elevation of the distinguished Whig lawyer, Somers, to the Keepership of the Great Seal (which took place at the end of the Session) was really intended as a counterpoise. Burnet rejoiced; since he entertained for Somers an admiring regard which seems to have been in some sort reciprocated. For it is said that while Somers held the Seal, the Chancellor's patronage in the diocese of Salisbury was always at Burnet's disposal.

During the summer of 1693 took place a Scotch Session under the management of Secretary Johnston. His instructions delighted Burnet. At the instance apparently of Mary he received orders for a secret enquiry into the rumoured massacre of Glencoe; and he was desired to obtain an Act, allowing such Episcopal clergy as would conform to retain their cures, without a specific abjuration of episcopacy.

This scheme, however, though earnestly seconded by Tillotson, and furthered by Johnston with great dexterity and the straining of his family credit in Presbyterian circles, was doomed to failure. The Episcopalians, who were in general Jacobite, refused to come in. Johnston nonetheless was displeased by the coldness with which William repaid his efforts; and his irritated mortification is clearly mirrored in Burnet's entry of September 9 following.

Abroad, the season was darkened by naval and military disaster, and Burnet's spirits sank. "It is not safe," he wrote early in September, 1693, "to argue from our notions "to what may be expected from the providence of God, "which is an unsearchable abyss; yet I am often forced to "think, that unless God is making use of England to carry "on some other great design...we must be cast into some "dismal calamities, which as a furnace may purify us and "melt us down....Arise then, O God...and establish the "work of thy hands among us."

William meanwhile sought more mundane assistance. Suddenly, and in preparation for the winter session, he abandoned the system of coalition ministries, emphasised so recently as the preceding spring. In order to fix responsibility in a definite quarter he now resolved to choose a party and work through it, and his choice eventually fell on the Whig interest, which at that time had the preponderance in the Commons. His mentor, as all knew, was the astute and cynical Sunderland, the doubly apostate minister of James II, who had recently crept back into business. "His behaviour in former reigns," wrote Burnet, eighteen months later, "made people conclude "that he could not be firm himself to principles of public "liberty; and therefore, though they were glad that, at any "rate, the King was brought about, yet a deep jealousy still "remained of the King's own inclinations." As for the Whigs "they" (says Burnet) "grew to be very hearty for "the King when they saw he intended to put himself in "their hands;...for men grow...patriots or courtiers as they "happen to be well or ill used."

The Session of 1693–4 was as usual agitated; but under a more consistent ministerial guidance Parliament at length responded, with moderate alacrity, to the Governmental

spur. The war taxes amounted to several millions; and ordinary expedients being soon exhausted, the balance was raised, on fairly favourable terms; upon the understanding that the shareholders should be incorporated into a Bank of England. Burnet's observations on this head hardly suggest the supposed initiator of a great financial revolution[1]. "This matter," he says, "was so strongly argued on both "sides, that I confess I understand it not enough to form "a sure judgment upon it. I do rather think the bank will "be an advantage to the nation as it is certainly a great "one to the King, since they furnish...money on...eas[y] "terms."

The attention of the House of Lords, meanwhile, was largely engrossed by a singularly nauseous divorce suit. The criminality of the Duchess of Norfolk lay beyond doubt; but party passion, and the gross provocation she had received from her husband, divided public sympathy. The question however really at issue was whether the Duke should obtain leave for remarriage. The abortive Canons prepared by the English Reformers, would have sanctioned remarriage, in the case of the *injured* party. Actually, however, express Parliamentary authority was required for each remarriage; and only two Acts of this nature had been passed since the Reformation. The point seems to have been now referred to the Episcopal bench. All the post-revolution Bishops (including of course Burnet, whose views we already know[2]) voted for the permission; all the Caroline and Jacobean Bishops against it. The comments of the "rigid" churchmen—whether Jurors or Nonjurors—may be imagined.

A fresh episode gave them another handle against Burnet. Towards the close of 1693 the Bishop had prepared for publication four of the *Discourses* which had been delivered, as preludes to discussion, at Diocesan Visitations. The Preface is dated December 8, and the book, which was licensed January 22 following, demands some attention. For it defines Burnet's attitude on some important points and excited a storm of obloquy, political and religious.

In the Preface, Burnet explains his scope. The work

[1] See *supra*, p. 317. [2] See *supra*, p. 245.

is to assist controversialists against opponents of four classes.

In the first he includes "atheists and libertines" (freethinkers) whose doctrines "dissolve all the bounds [*sic*] "of nature and society."

The second division contains the Socinians, who are in general men of strict morals, just and charitable. But by denying the reality of spiritual intercommunication with the Divine, they deprive religion of its emotional incentives. Their repudiation of God's foreknowledge leaves optimism without support; as their notions of a future state lessen salutary hopes and fears. Even on these points, therefore, their opinions bear directly "upon practice." But when we come to the fundamentals of Christianity—the doctrines of Incarnation and Atonement—their view, and the received opinion, are so diametrically at variance, as to constitute a bar against intercommunion.

Third come the Roman Catholics; these must be encountered on their own crucial topic, Infallibility.

And in the fourth place Burnet proposes to treat of the Protestant Nonconformists, whose arguments gain no intrinsic value from the civil sanctions of the Toleration Act.

An exordium so undeniably appropriate proves, however, but the herald of a political digression. With impassioned pathos Burnet implores his clergy, as they value Liberty and Religion, to support the reigning Sovereigns against Popery, Tyranny and France. He proceeds to justify the Revolution; and unluckily for him relies more especially on two precedents—the Maccabean revolt and the contest between Constantius and Licinius—which had been vigorously controverted in his own early *Vindication*.

The first *Discourse* is on the "Truth of the Christian "religion." Its topics are drawn, in the first place, from an asserted agreement between the Christian Religion, the facts of psychology, and the moral instinct. We feel within us a principle "that both thinks and acts freely and "...is totally different from matter which neither thinks nor "chooses. This principle...feels that *its thoughts do direct "its freedom, in all that it does*" (how unexpectedly Kantian a touch!) "and therefore is capable of good or evil, of

"rewards and punishments." With these principles, as with natural morality, Christianity is in perfect harmony. Burnet then treats of the historical argument; cites the testimony of the Messianic Scriptures, of Josephus, and of the evangelical writers. As to the Gospels, he ridicules the hypothesis of elaborate forgery; forgery undertaken, as he points out, in the interests of purity and sincerity. *Verbal inspiration* he rejects, save perhaps in the case of Moses; and specifically allows *degrees* of inspiration. "Those holy penmen writ in such a diversity, that it is "apparent every one was left to his own...genius as to "style...."

The second *Discourse* concerns the nativity and death of Christ. Burnet contests the Socinian position "that "everything of which we can form no distinct idea is nothing "to us." We cannot indeed forgo the agency of our senses, or receive that which contradicts them; but we accept much which we can neither prove nor realise. The blind believe in sight; we all appreciate the result of mathematical processes, of which the steps transcend our faculties. The difficulties inherent in any scheme of natural religion—such as those which relate to the necessary being of God—are as fundamental as anything in the mysteries of Christianity. On the Incarnation his views are those embodied in the letters to Van Limborch; and he taxes the Socinians with professing reverence for writers who, on their own hypothesis, deserve little respect. For St John, from the Socinian standpoint, appears "a most incongruous writer; "[who] could...say of Christ Jesus 'This is the true God "'and Eternal Life'; and in the very next words add, "'Little Children, keep yourselves from idols.'"

As to the dogma of the Atonement Burnet deprecates "Subtleties in which the Scripture is absolutely silent"; the "contexture of legal metaphysics" which so inappropriately weighs "infinities one against another." The essential suffering of Christ consisted (he maintains) in vicarious mental torment; which constituted not only an *illustration* of the horrors of sin, and the love and goodness of God, but a "propitiatory and expiatory sacrifice." This was offered "both upon our account and in our stead"; and in consequence, God proffers the world pardon and blessing.

Thus far Burnet follows the usual track of Protestant theology. But in developing his thesis he becomes far from clear. It is impossible to grasp how he interprets *expiation*. He seems repelled in opposite directions by dislike of the Roman theory which ascribes merit to human acts; and by a contrary revulsion from the doctrine of imputed righteousness. That dogma he regards as revolting to the moral sense and as tending to Antinomianism. The Pauline "works of the law" are for him the *ritual precepts of the Mosaic economy*; and he defines the Pauline faith as "*the complex of all the duties of Christianity*" *outward as well as inward*. His attitude, therefore, is not very self-consistent; and since we have frequently compared Burnet to Bishop Wilberforce, we may contrast Burnet's ambiguous logic with Wilberforce's admirably cogent reconciliation of the Pauline and Jacobean standpoints.

The third *Discourse* (on Infallibility) but repeats his earlier arguments against Rome; and we need only notice that it contains an eulogy of Chillingworth.

The fourth *Discourse* (on the obligation of Church communion) is historically important, as defining Burnet's attitude towards the nonconforming sects. "A lazy "compliance with everything that is uppermost" must, he declares, end by enervating, not only intellectual energy, but religious sincerity and zeal, and make way for ecclesiastical tyranny. Yet, "a wanton cavilling at everything, "the breaking of an established order" detract equally from the great ends of religion. More especially they derogate from that charity which is "a main part of the glory as well "as of the duties of our religion"; and which obliges us to meet in common worship, for the strengthening of love and union. He maintains that a man is not morally free to *choose* his religious body; for unless the terms of communion seem unlawful the abandonment of the national church becomes a sin; and a "bare aversion or dislike" (ungrounded on reason or Scripture) cannot rank as a conscientious scruple.

The general objections of the dissenters to the imposition of non-scriptural rites he expounds and answers much after the manner of Hooker. In especial he deprecates, as the most fruitful source of superstition, a

belief in the necessary immutability of rites whether simple or ornate. Even a ritual excessively elaborate, if shorn of criminal details, cannot, he argues, justify separation. He defends the cross in baptism, and kneeling at the Communion, as edifying, though non-essential forms; describes the three Ministerial Orders as Apostolic; and is strong on the subject of a liturgy. The language of any minister, so he argues, constitutes a form, "to which all the rest of the "assembly is limited; the question then lies...between the "sudden conceptions of one man, who is often young, rash, "without judgment...and a form well digested...by a body "of wise and good men." The Anglican liturgy (so he argues) may be safely preferred to any that has existed, or is likely to exist.

The charge of laxity in admission to the Eucharist is met by the response, that confirmation provides, or should provide, a test of preliminary fitness. The objection to the surplice ("now esteemed," he says, "the least considerable "of all") evokes the unanswerable argument, that a white garment of one particular fashion cannot be more inherently sinful than a black one of another. He argues strongly for "anniversary" holy days, and an annual round of devotion; though an "over valuing of these things" is clearly superstitious. As regards Lent he deprecates a "nice distinction "of meats." The Church only recommends prayer and abstinence in general; a fish diet (then and till the middle of last century prescribed by statute) is of legal, not spiritual obligation. To Anabaptist objections he returns the usual responses; and pleads that a belief in the salvation of baptised innocents agrees with our ideas of "the infinite goodness of God." To the Quakers he suggests, that the principle of the Inward Light, uncorrected by any other, must lead to Antinomianism; that Baptism, the Eucharist, and the Ministry were instituted by Christ himself; that the Apostles discouraged the public ministrations of women; and that, while we must never in essential matters "be conformed to the world," trivial external shibboleths contravene the example of Christ and derogate from the dignity of religion. Judicial oaths, he adds, appear in both Testaments; and whatever the origin of tithes, once land has been bought so charged, to refuse payment becomes

sheer dishonesty. The Quakers object to war; but do they (he enquires) decline war taxation ?

In fine, however, Burnet hints to the churchman, on the general issue, that concession, even where not necessary, is often expedient. He urges candour, Christian charity, and an emulation in virtue, as the best means of subduing schism.

These *Discourses* gave great satisfaction in certain august quarters. After perusing (as we gather) the MS. both Tillotson and the Queen urged Burnet to undertake a yet "greater work"; a commentary, namely, on the Thirty-nine Articles. Upon this task Burnet seems to have entered by the beginning of the year 1694.

On the other hand to the extreme churchmen the *Discourses*, as we have already hinted, afforded a welcome pretext for attack. "A man," writes Burnet cruelly, but not altogether unfairly, "that will magnify the authority of "the clergy and...the rights of the Church...and that "declaims bitterly against dissenters, how weakly...and how "falsely soever...will pass for a true Churchman...among "corrupt Clergymen." And though, on the other hand, they dare not openly assault a reformer ("for they know "that the world will be against them") they "will wait for "some doctrinal point that they may more safely charge him "with heresy." The specific accusation, in this instance, became that of Socinianism.

The charge seems to have been commonly urged against the Tillotsonian school, and against Tillotson more especially—and most unfairly. In Burnet's case it had been originally suggested by the critical remarks (contained in his *Travels*) on the text "of the Three Witnesses." Moreover, about 1691, during a long controversy with the minister Jurieu, Bossuet had striven to show that the drift of Protestantism (whereof he described Jurieu, Basnage and Burnet as the three principal champions) was towards Unitarianism. Burnet he had more particularly charged with having argued (in his answer to Bossuet's *Variations*) that the doctrine of the Trinity had been gradually elaborated; and with including the Socinians in a project of universal intercommunion. How unfounded was the last charge may be gathered, not only from the

already quoted *Discourses* and the earlier correspondence with Van Limborch, but from another interesting Latin letter to Van Limborch, dated November 18, 1694. This apparently alludes to a recent work by Mr Firmin, the Unitarian, Tillotson's philanthropic ally; whom Tillotson had himself referred for confutation to Burnet, as to a champion of orthodoxy on this topic. "The Socinian "controversy," writes Burnet, "is especially acute; and "our Socinians have now exchanged that truly Christian "modesty of style, which was the honour of their sect, "for scurrility and fury." He believes the dispute to be fomented by the Deists, who, that they may discredit the Scriptures, encourage the Socinians to ridicule the Orthodox view, of which they themselves maintain the Scriptural validity. "Others there are," he adds, referring to the extreme churchmen, "who charge the mildness "of some among the Bishops with the discredit of these "discussions; and trust they may find therein an opportunity "of reversing the General Toleration, under which we live "in harmony and happiness." The Orthodox, he admits, are not always judicious in their arguments; but Bull's [recent slip? in the *Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*?] is due to the ardour of debate. Burnet warns Van Limborch however "that the leniency shown to the Socinians by the "Remonstrants, who communicate with them, and minimize "the difference between them, makes the worst impression "here. For though civil Toleration should not be restricted "by any dogmatic bounds, Ecclesiastical Toleration has its "limits. For if I believe, that communion with idolaters is "to be avoided; that idolaters should be repudiated; if "I believe (as we acknowledge) that the worship which "Socinians pay to Jesus Christ, is on their own hypotheses, "idolatrous; it follows they must be excluded from "communion. Moreover, among us, the Socinians al- "together repudiate the worship of Christ; and merely "invoke Him; but even this they describe as a matter "of indifference (adiaphora)."

This passage even if it stood alone would stamp Burnet as no Socinian. Whether he did or did not steer with perfect success between the Scylla of Sabellianism and the Charybdis of Tritheism, may be left to theoretic theo-

logians; but it is not permissible to doubt his faith in the Divinity of Christ.

The charge of Socinianism was none the less endorsed by the celebrated Jacobite controversialist Charles Leslie, to whose acrimonious pen we may probably ascribe an anonymous diatribe against Burnet, published four years earlier under the title of *The State Proteus*. Well read in Gallican theology, he may perhaps have met with Bossuet's strictures on Burnet; and his ire was now fanned into flame by Burnet's anti-Jacobite preface. His retort to the *Discourses* bears the cumbrously sarcastic title: *Tempora Mutantur, or the great change from 73 to 93. In the travels of a Professor of Theology at Glasgow from the Primitive and Episcopal Loyalty, through Italy, Geneva, etc. to the deposing doctrine under Papistico-Phanatico-Prelatico colours at Salisbury* [*etc. etc.*].

The scheme of this tract (as of most Jacobite onslaughts upon Burnet) is admirably simple and exquisitely calculated to annoy. It consists in juxtaposing (without their context) quotations of a directly opposite tendency from his earlier and later works. Burnet's exasperation is revealed in his autobiography; where he resentfully remarks that the discontented clergy "found a rude pre-"tender to learning who fell on me in a very petulant style, "but so poorly in point of argument that he seemed to have "no other design in writing but to rail at me. I would not "answer him; two others did very fully."

During the summer which ensued Burnet's correspondence with Tillotson appears unusually active. To Tillotson Burnet applied on a matter which excited his abiding resentment. On the death of Sancroft (which occurred in 1693) it had been discovered that his chaplain, by his directions, had withdrawn from the Registry of Canterbury the instrument under which Burnet had been consecrated. The failure to return it was presumably due—as was urged by Sancroft's friends—to mere inadvertence. But under the circumstances of the case it is not surprising that Burnet, who was put to some trouble and threatened with great expense in recovering the deed, should have regarded its abstraction as a deliberate attempt to jeopardise his own title to Episcopal orders.

Both Burnet and Tillotson, again, were keenly interested in an episcopal meeting at Lambeth; convened by Tillotson with a view to the correction of abuses, more especially that of non-residence. The issue of purely episcopal instructions on the point seems to have been mooted. Burnet however doubted the legal validity of such a step; and his doubts derive support from the previously expressed opinion of Bishop Fell. Burnet himself suggested a Royal Mandate, requiring the Archbishop to transmit such instructions to his suffragans. Tillotson eventually acquiesced; and Burnet draughted the suggested Mandate, for Tillotson's correction. It was also proposed to reissue certain Ordination Rules, drawn up by Sancroft, but suppressed, in that case also, by the advice of Fell.

Burnet, meanwhile, was proceeding rapidly on the composition of his great work on the Articles. Assisted by materials collected for his theological lectures at Glasgow and for that work on religious truth which has so unaccountably disappeared, he finished it, as he tells us, "within a year after I undertook it." He submitted the MS. to the Archbishop who "read it all over and corrected it "in many places"; and on October 23 wrote to Burnet the well-known letter of approval which contains an oft-quoted sentence. "The account given of Athanasius's creed" (observes Tillotson) "seems to me no wise satisfactory; "I wish we were well rid of it." The letter concluded with a prayer that Burnet might long be spared to do such service to the Church.

Little can the gentle writer have guessed, as he penned the devout aspiration, how nearly his own day drew to its term. Within the month, an apoplectic seizure surprised him in Whitehall Chapel while conducting divine service. Five days later he peacefully expired.

To Burnet the blow was as terrible as it was unexpected; for Tillotson had held the primacy little over three years. Upon Burnet fell the task of preaching the funeral sermon; and Oldmixon, who was present, tells us that the preacher's voice was at one moment choked by his tears.

The sermon, as we shall see, gave great umbrage to the Jacobites. The eulogy of one "renegade" by another naturally excited their spleen; and they justly resented

an uncalled for attack on Sancroft which evinces personal animus. Moreover the discourse lies open to wider criticism. A fine preacher—a cautious administrative reformer—mild in his manners—bland and pedestrian in his piety, and weighty by dint of "sanctified common sense"—Tillotson's virtues were not of the militant order. Few could less successfully sustain comparison with the restless energy, the meteoric ardour of the Apostle Paul; and Burnet by suggesting the parallel but exposed his friend to the savage ridicule of his foes.

As successor to the vacant see, the Queen urged the appointment of Stillingfleet, by far the ablest and most resolute administrator then on the Episcopal bench. In this proposition Burnet seems to have concurred. Party spirit however prevailed, and Tenison, a dull but conscientious clergyman, who held strong Whig opinions, was preferred to the Primacy.

He was a personal friend of Burnet's who regarded him with much respect. But it is clear that, Tillotson gone, Burnet's hopes for ecclesiastical reform and religious revival centred entirely round the Queen. She had invariably acted as Regent, during her husband's absences abroad; while for nearly five years the administration of ecclesiastical affairs had been left wholly to her discretion. That Burnet was admitted to her innermost confidence we shall not aver; for no one—not even the husband she so passionately loved—had access to the *arcana* of a nature as strong as it was gentle. But into the outer courts of the citadel Burnet, as even her husband confessed, had penetrated as far as most. Increased knowledge had but intensified the respect first evinced, eight years earlier, in the letter to Fall. "I never," writes Burnet in 1695, "admired any person so entirely as I did "her. In the course of above eight years very particular "knowledge of her, I never saw any one thing that I could "have wished...otherwise." He praises, with equal fervour, "her understanding, her piety and her virtue....The purity "and sublimity of her mind was the perfectest thing I ever "saw....And as I thank God that I do still feel the sense of "the Christian religion, and...the reformation of it from "popery to be that which lies nearer my heart than all the

"things of this world...so I cannot without a very particular "joy see that person...[who is marked] out to be both the "defender and perfecter of that blessed work...such in all "the parts both of her private deportment and...public "administration...that she seems to...have been born" to that end. "I am sensible," he adds, "that I perhaps "return too oft to this....It is almost the only thing that "supports my thoughts against the melancholy...which all "other views of our affairs gives."

At the time of Tillotson's death she was still but 32 years old, and a long continuance of her rule might be reasonably anticipated. Just a month later however, feverish symptoms developed. On the following day, December 19, Burnet had an audience of half-an-hour. Discussing the proposed injunctions to the clergy she evinced no great hopes of success, but announced, none the less, her firm resolution to proceed; she also touched on her darling scheme of transforming Greenwich Palace into a Hospital for sea-veterans. Twenty-four hours later her state occasioned anxiety; by December 22 the illness was pronounced small-pox, of a malignant type.

In William, admiring affection for a once neglected wife had been steadily increasing, ever since her conduct at the Revolution had revealed to him what she was; and the news of her danger overwhelmed him with horror and remorse. Before Burnet, who on the 23rd was specially summoned to his closet, he completely broke down. "He "cried out very violently; he told me he had no hope; and "that from being the happiest he was going to be the "miserablest creature on earth....There was a worth in her "that none knew besides himself; though he said" (adds Burnet) "I knew her as much as any other person did." These agonizing fears were soon and terribly justified; for fatal symptoms almost immediately appeared.

The Queen faced death with unaffected calm; her life had been a hard one, and she had no desire to live. "The day before she died," writes Burnet, "she received "the sacrament; all the bishops that were attending "being admitted to receive it with her. We were, God "knows, a sorrowful company; for we were losing her who "was our chief hope and glory on earth." Delirium super-

vened; and on December 28, about an hour after midnight, she passed quietly away.

"I never," wrote Burnet, three months later, "felt myself "sink so much under anything that had happened to me... "it is a daily load upon my thoughts, and gives me great "apprehensions of very heavy judgments hanging over us." For it seemed, to his fears, that she was taken from the evil to come.

To Mary's memory he dedicated, early in 1695, the fine rhapsody which he calls *An Essay on the Late Queen.* In luxuriance of appreciation it may seem perhaps to violate the sane and reticent instincts of the Stuart who was Clarendon's grandchild. Yet if less a portrait than an apotheosis, its extravagance, so to speak, is rather in hue than in outline; the likeness is true and consists with other representations. And the almost lyrical fervour of the whole tells the passion of regret that underlies; it is, as Mary's Dutch biographer has well expressed it, a true "cry from "the heart."

CHAPTER IX.

REIGN OF WILLIAM III. 1695—1702.

SOMEWHAT to the general astonishment, the death of Mary proved a blow to her husband under which it was feared he might succumb. Overwhelmed by grief and penitence, he sought the consolations of that religion, which had been his wife's stay; and strove, in every quarter, to demonstrate his respect for her memory. The Mistress, whose ascendancy had long embittered their relations, received her dismissal. The Greenwich scheme was energetically forwarded; and the King resolved there should be no breach in the continuity of ecclesiastical policy. The injunctions to the clergy, which had occupied Mary to the last, were issued on February 15; and on April 6 the King, says Burnet, "granted a commission to the two "Archbishops[1], the Bishops of Lichfield[2], Worcester[3], Ely[4], "and myself, to recommend fit persons to all ecclesiastical "preferments; and did charge us to seek out the...worthiest "men....This" he adds (writing within the month) "has "a very good appearance; and if it...is well managed by us "it may have happy effects; though I confess my hopes are "so sunk with the Queen's death, that I do not flatter "myself with further expectations. If things can be kept "in tolerable order, so that we may have peace...in our "days, I dare look for no more."

The responsibilities of the Commissioners were heavy. On the vacancy of all Crown patronage (the Bishoprics included) which was above a certain small value they were charged to recommend one or more suitable nominees. During the King's absences abroad they even *presented* to all Crown preferment under the yearly value of £140.

[1] Tenison and Sharp.
[2] Lloyd.
[3] Stillingfleet.
[4] Patrick.

This "Ecclesiastical Commission" was of course unpopular. The very title had invidious associations. The concentration of patronage in the hands of a small group excited jealousy; and respectable as was the composition of the board, its members in the main represented a single school of thought.

Beyond the ecclesiastical sphere meanwhile, Burnet's importance was greatly diminished. The free access he had enjoyed under Mary now ceased; and in a speech of ten years later, he clearly restricts his first-hand knowledge of foreign affairs to the lifetime of the late Queen.

In the spring of 1695 died two of Burnet's early friends; the Duke of Hamilton and Lord Halifax. He had ceased to respect either; while it is said that Halifax declined Burnet's last ministrations; lest the Divine (using him, as he had used Rochester, to "point" a pious "moral") should "triumph over him after his death." To other ears, however, Halifax avowed sentiments of religion which surprised the world and edified his former friend. Two years later (writing to the chaplain at Lisbon, who had charged our envoy with impiety), Burnet suggestively hints: "I have "known some who have delighted mightily...in the venting "of paradoxes, and...for that reason passed [as] atheists, "who yet I am sure were not so, as it appeared at their "death."

The year 1695 was for Burnet replete with controversy. On February 2 he dated from Westminster an elaborate retort to Unitarian attacks on his own *Four Discourses*[1]. It is remarkable for its indignant rejection of the previously discussed charge, that the "orthodox" Latitudinarians of the day were concealed Socinians; and that they acquiesced in Trinitarian formulas for the sake of lucre or reputation. "If I did not," he says, "sincerely believe [the] "doctrine [of the Incarnation] I should think it a horrid "prevaricating with God and man, to make confessions "which I do not believe, and to join in acts of worship "which I think idolatrous." Silence in such cases implies, he says, consent, "and he must live and die in a state

[1] In the form of a letter to Dr Williams with whose *Vindication* of Stillingfleet and Tillotson it was subsequently printed.

"of damnation," who, on such crucial points, suggests, even tacitly, belief in doctrines he repudiates. "The blackest "part of the charge of idolatry which we lay on the Church "of Rome is a mild thing" compared to the guilt of those who can "worship One as the Great God" whom at heart they deem "a mere creature."

In the same letter Burnet animadverts severely on the crude (if convenient) "Higher Criticism" of the Socinians; who, while professing reverence for the Scriptures in general, assumed the interpolation of all passages incompatible with their own thesis.

To the charge of discrepancy among Trinitarian apologists Burnet responds by distinguishing between "that which is a part of our religion, and those conceptions "by which we may more distinctly set it forth." All who acknowledge a Providence, and a Trinity-in-Unity, and all who worthily receive the sacrament are of one religion on these points; though they differ as to the *doctrines* of Predestination, Hypostatic Union, or Consubstantiation. His definition of true textual criticism is excellent; and the little treatise, though written at a distance from his books, is one of the ablest among his controversial efforts.

On April 12 following, again, Burnet dated an anonymous reply to an attack from the contrary direction. A Mr Hill (of the diocese of Bath and Wells) who had been present at the original delivery of the second among the published *Discourses*, had undertaken to "Vindicate" the "Primitive Fathers" from the "Imputations" of the Bishop. Burnet's patristic lore was perhaps a little rusty; and Mr Hill, deeply read in primitive theology, seems to have caught the prelate more than once tripping. His tract, however, if sometimes eloquent, is needlessly offensive in style; and the licenser (a Professor of Hebrew at Oxford) had had to offer Burnet a formal apology for his laxity in authorizing its publication. Burnet's anonymous retort to Mr Hill makes great parade of authorities; and charges Hill—a warm apologist of tradition—with conceding to Rome all her advocates demand; namely, that the Evangelical message has no validity *quoad nos* till endorsed by the fiat of the Church.

The most vigorous onslaught, however, which engaged

Burnet's attention is contained in *Some Discourses* (on the Tillotson funeral sermon), which were published anonymously by Dr Hickes, deprived Dean of Worcester, and a bishop-suffragan among the Nonjurors. As a former chaplain of Lauderdale, a very "rigid" churchman, and a Jacobite, he had three topics of public quarrel with Burnet; and these, as we know, were reinforced by a personal grudge. The present was not his first attack upon Burnet; but it was by far the most comprehensive. A rambling tract of some 100 pages (about half of which is devoted to the disparagement of Tillotson), it contains the quintessence of all charges against Burnet made up to this date. His Latitudinarianism, and his political "apostasy"; his leniency to dissenters and asserted severity to Non-jurors; his youthful denunciation of the Scottish Bishops, and the Lauderdale Dedication; his heat of temper and his mystical proclivities; his *Case of Barrenness* and his supposed Socinianism; his textual inaccuracy and reputed editorial dishonesties; not to mention his opportune repudiation[1] of the legend, which exalts the "passive obedience" of a martyred "Thebean Legion"; all these are handled hap-hazard, and with amusing vehemence. The *bona fides* of Hickes is obvious, and he does not stoop to the grosser insinuations so commonly endorsed by his brethren; but many hearsay charges have been so distorted in transit, as to eventuate in absolute calumny; while despite Dr Hickes' deserved reputation for scholarship the critical animadversions are by no means free from error.

This attack drew from Burnet the retort or *Reflections* so frequently quoted in the present work. This apology, which is alternatively entitled *The Bishop of Sarum's Vindication*, proved, if in parts acrimonious, on the whole much more temperate than the diatribe to which it is a reply. The counter-charge of Hickes, which was never published, lies still in the Bodleian; and has also been used for the purposes of our investigation.

The public events of this summer are best explained in a hitherto unpublished letter from Burnet to the Electress Sophia, the earliest in date recovered. About this corre-

[1] In the preface to his translation of the pseudo-Lactantius, *De Mortuis Persecutorum*, published by him in Holland, 1687. In the *Vindication of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 58–9, the story of this "martyrdom" had been endorsed with special gusto.

spondence there hangs a certain mystery. We are aware that Burnet had early fixed his hopes on the succession of the Hanoverian duchess; and that in 1689 William (anxious to propitiate the Guelph interest on the continent) had employed him to move an amendment to the Bill of Rights, definitely settling the final reversion of the Crown on the House of Hanover. This had been defeated; by the efforts, as both Burnet and the Court of Hanover believed, of the Republican party. A loophole was thus left for any one of the fifty or more *nearer* heirs professing the Roman Catholic faith, who should (in the reverse sense to Henry IV) weigh the mass against a crown. The Court of Hanover, meanwhile, whose interests and ambitions were restricted to the limits of the Holy Roman Empire, cared little for the prospect of a crown regarded as precarious and thorny; while the Electress herself, impelled by family loyalty, desired the rehabilitation of her innocent nephew, "The Pretender." William III was therefore turning his eyes in another direction; and dangling the glittering bait before the Papist House of Savoy, an important limb of the coalition. Of all this, Burnet was probably ignorant; and his own hopes remained immutably fixed on the Hanoverian House. That a regular correspondence had been initiated by his report of the proposition of 1689, with the Princess Sophia's polite evasive reply, seems very probable; but of the fifty letters which the Bishop is said to have received from her, only two were printed by his son. The first of Burnet's own epistles yet extant is the one we now give, dating from the period when the death of Mary left but three lives, none very good, in the line of the recognised succession; but it certainly appears to presuppose much previous communication. It is dated September 26, 1695, is much damaged[1], and begins as follows:

"May it please your Electoral Highness,

"When there is no occasion of laying any thing "before your E[lectoral] H[ighness] I think it is the truest "expression of respect, not to presume upon your goodness, "nor to trouble you to no purpose. This summer ends "very differently from any that we have seen during the "war. The French have lost two of the best places they

[1] The words in brackets are conjecturally restored.

"had[1], and our King by taking Namur, and in all the steps "of that matter, has shewed that nothing can stand before "him and his army; and though our fleets have not done "that which was perhaps expected upon the French coast, "yet by th[e] perpetual alarms they were kept in we have "quite spoil[ed their] trade, and so raised our own that in "no t[im]e of peace it was as high as it is now. So that "this nation is [less w]eary of [the war] and less uneasy "under it, than it has been any ye[ar since it] began. We "are now in daily expectation of the King's [orders] con- "cerning the calling a new Parliament: which by [what] we "can judge will be made up of the [m]en of the whole "nati[on who ar]e the most zealous for his service. And "though all Eur[ope feared th]at this nation could not be "easily gover[n]ed in the [King's ab]sence by reason of our "irreparable loss of our great [and] blessed Queen; yet we "[h]ave been managed with such [able and w]ise counsels "that we [h]ave not had any dis[t]urbances [by reason o]f "it. So that the French are disappointe[d] o[f] that "wher[on they] depended so much, upon that never enough "lamented death. Our Lords Justices, by assuming no "title nor rank, except when four of them were together, "have avoided all the envy and jealousy which that high "trust might have given; and their having no appointments "for it has made that post to be the less desired. So that "the method of governing us during the King's absence is "now so well begun and fixed that the fear of it is quite "over. And yet, after all, the danger we are still in by "the King exposing himself upon all occasions gives us "such dreadful apprehensions, that we do very earnestly "desire a good peace; though we were never more able to "carry on the war than we are at present. If the French "do not make reasonable offers for such a peace as shall "both settle and secure all Europe, their King may commit "the same error (and with the same ill effects) in this age, "that Philip the Second committed in the last; who for "above twenty years might have had peace on what terms "he pleased; but he lost his time, and continued [the] war "till he was forced to accept of one on any terms whatso- "ever. One reason that makes us wish for peace is, to see

[1] Namur and Casal.

"the dispute about the" (Hanoverian) "Electorate at an end, "for the traverses to it will be very probably [not] appeased "till a general peace settles all the concerns of Europe; "and [our] affairs have now such a relation to your Electoral "House that [we are] very insensible if we do not enter "into all its interests[1].

"[I will] not abuse your E[lectoral] H[ighness]'s good- "ness any longer. I lay myself at [your fee]t with the "profoundest respect and beg that your E[lectoral] H[igh- "ness] will look on me [as he] that is with an inviolable "duty" [etc., etc.].

In Scotland, meanwhile, an important session had taken place, which had been practically manœuvred by Secretary Johnston. It was he who had warned the King, and warned him in vain, of the pitfalls underlying the so-called "Darien" scheme. It was, so Burnet declares, his dexterity which, in view of the difficulty as to filling the northern vacancies, had induced the Presbyterians to acquiesce in a government measure; encouraging loyal Episcopalian ministers, if acceptable to their parishioners, to retain their benefices, though without a seat in Church Courts. It was he whose personal urgency had secured the adhesion of above seventy such ministers in the northern counties "where "the episcopal clergy were both the most numerous...the "most esteemed," and we may add the most needed. If, as we suspect, Burnet had some share in these efforts, they represent one of the few occasions when his irenical ardour told. For at the time of the Union no less than one hundred and sixty-five Episcopal Ministers were still officiating in their parishes.

Johnston's services, however, were but ill-requited; for which Burnet gives a sinister reason. Johnston, as we know, had actively pursued the Glencoe investigation. A Special Commission had reported this summer to the Scottish Parliament; but, through the exertions of the Portland junto, which retained the royal support, the

[1] Ernest Augustus, in 1692, had obtained the coveted Ninth Electorate. Owing to the jealousies ecclesiastical, political and dynastic of the other Electoral Houses, his envoy was however refused a seat in the College; and despite English support, the claim was postponed till 1708.

guilt of Stair was practically condoned; and Johnston's disgrace became then but a question of time.

The succeeding winter-session in England (which followed on a general election) was on the whole pacific. Towards its close, however, some friction arose. The imprudent munificence of a royal grant to Benthinck, Lord Portland, aroused grave discontent; while a jealousy of Dutch commerce and of the Scottish Darien project, and the irritation excited by the inadequacy of our convoy system, found vent in the proposal to create, by Parliamentary authority, a Council of Trade. This Burnet, who regarded the scheme as Republican in tendency, deprecated quite as strongly as did William III.

The Darien outcry gave a colour for Johnston's dismissal; and in February 1696, on this flagrantly unjust pretext, Johnston was cashiered in favour of Portland's nominee. Such at least is Burnet's contemporary version of the matter.

Burnet's indignation may be imagined; and with bitter comments on this ingratitude end the fragments of his Memoirs preserved in the British Museum. From this time forth, for a period of nearly twelve years, we are dependent for Burnet's narrative on his autobiography, and the published *History*; neither of which takes rank as quite contemporary evidence.

All ill-humours, meanwhile, were overwhelmed in the flood of patriotic alarm and indignation evoked in February 1696 by the sudden discovery of a Jacobite assassination plot, in which King James seemed to be an accomplice, and which was probably designed by Louis XIV as the prelude to a French invasion. "This black conspiracy...," wrote Burnet to the Electress on April 7, "has kindled in all "men's minds a zeal for the King and a horror of King "James beyond what I am able to express." How strongly moved was Burnet himself we shall see later on.

For to the following winter belongs the notorious episode of Fenwick. Implicated in the Franco-Jacobite invasion schemes of the preceding spring[1], he had evaded arrest until August. An intercepted letter having yielded moral proof of his guilt, he had proffered a non-judicial confession; wherein

[1] He is not charged with complicity in the assassination branch of the Plot.

he dexterously shielded his friends, while involving in a general charge of Jacobitism several among the leading ministers, Whig no less than Tory. However conscious as to the truth of these disclosures, William preferred to ignore them; he dismissed the confession as inadequate, and left Fenwick to the law. His friends managed to corrupt a witness; and conviction became thus impossible.

Russell, an incriminated Whig, declined to forgo his revenge. At his instance a Bill of Attainder against Fenwick was proposed in the Lower House. It was thereupon moved, by a violent supporter of this measure, that the Lords Spiritual (as professed advocates for mercy) should be ignored in the preamble. The opposition satirically supported the motion; on the plea that their Lordships, as creatures of the Court, were predisposed against the prisoner.

The motion, however, became void of itself, for it was contrary to Constitutional Law. Ancient Canons, it is true (on motives partly of superstition), condemned the concurrence of ecclesiastics in sentence of death; and under Henry II, as a matter of grace, the Spiritual Peers gained the right of withdrawing, before the final vote, from all capital *trials*. Till that stage of the proceedings their claim to a seat remained intact; though, as a rule they contrived to evade appearance altogether. Attainders, meanwhile, as technically *legislative* acts, were exempt from the scope of the compromise; and Spiritual Peers, defying sentiment and tradition, had voted for some of the worst among the Attainders under Henry VIII. On the Attainder of Strafford, however, the Bishops had unanimously withdrawn.

When the Fenwick Attainder Bill reached the House of Lords, a very general sense that capital cases should be debated in full session occasioned a "call of the House" (a Lord Chancellor's "whip"). It was enforced with unusual severity; and addressed to the Peers Spiritual as well as to their lay brethren. The Bishops (Burnet included) obeyed the summons; and several of them (Burnet again included) took an active part against the prisoner. They plead pressure from the House as the cause of their intervention; and belief in Fenwick's guilt to justify their animus against him.

Neither of these excuses suffice. The House had the

power to bring up recalcitrants under custody; but if they elected to brave its displeasure, it could not force them to vote. And strong should be the motives which induce complicity in Attainders—the "Lynch Law" of Jurisprudence. Necessity alone can condone them; and here no necessity could be pleaded. The hand of justice had fallen, with exemplary severity, on many of Fenwick's accomplices; he was himself inconsiderable; and he was hounded to death, not for the acknowledged crime he had undoubtedly projected, but for the offence he had given to the passions of a powerful party. For several among those concerned in the projected assassination had also, through the absence of sufficient evidence, escaped prosecution; and no attempt had been made to reach them by means of an Attainder. The second reading debates, which turned largely on the question of principle, would have afforded the chance to make a stand, in defence of the crucial principle, that punishment must be divorced from passion.

In Burnet's case the breach of professional decency was peculiarly glaring. His early *Memorial* to the Scottish Bishops had characterized, with great severity, Episcopal intervention *in causis* even remotely *sanguinis*. The *History of the English Reformation* had stigmatized, no less severely, Attainders passed against persons in actual custody. Moreover his Memoirs of twelve years earlier had reiterated his dislike to episcopal interference in cases of a capital nature. The Bishops' "unacquaintedness with "the law, and the wrong notion they generally have of civil "society, make them very unfit for those consultations.... "[*They*] *are considered as so many sure votes to the Court... "and being generally men of weak minds, they do very "probably comply with the King's solicitations often against "their own reasons.*" A treacherous Jacobite transcriber gave subsequent publicity to the passage; accompanied by the vitriolic comments which the Fenwick case suggested.

We may dismiss the Tory gibe that his lure was the hope of translation; against which he had resolved, and which he eventually declined. His patriotic resentments, however, may have been spurred by personal vanity. For the Government, on this issue, proved weak in debating power; and an adroit hint that the Ministry needed his

services would have appealed to Burnet's foible. Be that as it may, he contributed copiously to the debates, which were (he says) the hottest he had known ; and some even held that his speeches turned the scale against the prisoner. We detect in the *History* a very elaborate summary of the arguments employed. Attainders, in extraordinary cases, are described as the only resource, *if judicial torture be disallowed.* Appeal to the *History of the Reformation* is parried by a distinction between just attainders, and attainders on frivolous pretexts, or those in which the accused remains unheard. Against these, we must admit, the censures of the *Reformation* history mainly bear.

As the Bill passed its successive stages, however, the majority in its favour rapidly declined ; and matters were complicated by the discreditable tactics of Mordaunt, to be famous as the Earl of Peterborough. These brought on him deserved reprobation, which Burnet fully endorsed. Apprehending however (as did the King) what Mordaunt if desperate might do, he undertook, at William's desire, the undignified task of intercession. He reminded the House of Mordaunt's Revolution services : and by moving his committal to the Tower averted worse evils.

The Bill passed, and Fenwick's fate was sealed. He desired the last offices of a nonjuring Bishop; and secured to this end the "charitable" advocacy of Burnet. For this kindness, in a letter of January 20, he returned pathetic thanks. Two days later, on some delay in the completion of the favour, his wife prayed the Lords to intercede for a week's respite. The plea, valid under the circumstances, should have weighed with the Spiritual Peers. Yet Tenison and Burnet (who probably regarded the respite as the first step to a reprieve) incurred general odium by the vigour of their opposition. Burnet represented acquiescence as a sign of weakness ; for threatening letters had menaced the King in case of Fenwick's death. The Lords finally voted a qualified petition ; which, while urging the desired respite from a " charitable inclination to a condemned man," added the proviso, that such respite must be proved consistent with the safety of his majesty and the government. It was not easy to evade concurrence in so guarded

a prayer; and Burnet in fact seems to have voted for the address.

There was some idea that it would prove unacceptable to the King, who, one regrets to realize, was in favour of the attainder; and the "Lords with white staves," who usually bore such addresses, showed considerable agility in slipping out of the House. It was thereupon proposed (in malice apparently to Burnet) that he should accompany the Bishop of London as bearer of the address. Had he frankly acquiesced in the decision of the House, explaining that nothing save the interest of the public could bias him in favour of severity, he would have turned the tables on his tormentors. Unhappily, however, he lost his temper; "positively refused" the task; "and said their lordships "might send him to the Tower, but they had no right to "send him to Kensington." The House was scandalized; Lord Rochester begged his Peers to take the prelate at his word; and a storm was only averted by an episcopal apology, reinforced by the dexterity of a friend.

So ended what Burnet, with obvious misgiving, calls "that unacceptable affair, in which I had a much larger "share than might seem to become a man of my profession." It brought him, as even Burnet confesses, "under a great "load of censure"; exasperating the hatred of the Jacobites, disgusting the Tories, and alienating many among the discontented "Whigs." But it tended to identify Burnet more and more with the prejudices and resentments of Court or Ministerial "Whiggism."

Meanwhile the termination of hostilities abroad was visibly approaching; for the long duration of strife had proved a severe drain on the strength of all the belligerents, and the resources of France were for the time almost exhausted. From the middle of 1696 peace negotiations were "in the air"; with the spring of 1697 these took form and shape. In vain did James II, in two memorials, declaim against the recognition of his rival. Burnet is said to have draughted a proposed official reply, which was once at least recast, but finally abandoned: and the papers only appeared, anonymously, at a date some years subsequent. Meanwhile on September 3, 1697, the hoisting of a flag on Westminster Abbey proclaimed to an expectant England

that with the Peace of Ryswick had ended the eight years' war.

On the second of December following came the Public Thanksgiving for the Peace. Burnet preached before the King at Whitehall; and we follow Macaulay in endorsing Evelyn's censure of this "florid panegyric" on the King. The points selected for eulogy are no doubt just; and perhaps Burnet, who saw much to criticise in the terms of the Treaty, preferred to descant on a side-issue. But the choice of such a theme on such an occasion exemplifies the bad taste so characteristic of Burnet, under stress of great excitement. Equally offensive is the covert comparison of King James and the second Justinian.

The great event, however, had Burnet gained his way, would have been more suitably commemorated. In honour of the peace, Burnet urged upon William the completion of a scheme for which he had long before obtained the approbation of Mary, and which he had already pressed upon the King in a memorial dated January 1696. "The "tenths and first-fruits," says the memorial, "were first "laid on by the popes, on the pretence of supporting the "holy war; [under] Henry the Eighth, they were given to "the Crown; since that time they have been given away "in pensions....This revenue may be justly called in "question, *as unlawful and sacrilegious in its nature*; the "applying it to a good use is the best way to justify it." The memorial then refers to the "miserable" state of "many livings in this kingdom." In some places three of them put together do not amount to forty pounds a year; and Burnet opines that "a poor clergy may be scan-"dalous, but must be both ignorant and contemptible. "To this," he adds, "we owe in a great measure, the "atheism and impieties, and the sects and divisions, "that are among us." "It would," he thinks, "be a "noble demonstration, both of zeal for the honour of God "and religion, and of affection to the Church of England, "if the King would appropriate this revenue to the raising "the livings of England to some just proportion, beginning "at corporations, and livings in his Majesty's gift....A "corporation upon this might be settled" (as under Elizabeth, James I and his son) "to receive...gifts...towards the

"same end; and all bishops, deans and chapters might "be obliged to" contribute towards it. Nor does Burnet doubt but that "besides a blessing that may be expected "from God upon so noble a design...it would be made up "to the crown by the parliament; and would also give "such an impression of him, as would have a good effect "on all his affairs."

The wisdom of the serpent, obvious in this last insinuation, is yet more ingenuously displayed in the reiterative memorial of 1697; which urges that "this will be a noble "beginning of his Majesty's reign in peace, and a suitable "return to God, for his great blessings on his Majesty's "person[1] and his affairs....And since the boroughs are "generally the worst served...this will probably have a "great effect on all his Majesty's affairs, *and on the "election of succeeding Parliaments*[2]."

Even this pathetically frank attempt to gild the financial pill failed to move the existing Ministry. The influential, unscrupulous Sunderland had a lien on the fund; and despite the personal support of William, and the warm approbation of Princess Anne, the project made no way. Four years later, in reliance on the advocacy of Somers, Burnet thought himself within distance of success; when the King's death brought the whole once more to a stand.

The Peace of Ryswick, meanwhile, initiated but a troubled truce. The question of the Spanish Succession, which for forty years had loomed in the background of all continental controversies, appeared daily more imminent. William, in the lowering state of the continental horizon, wished to retain 30,000 men on the English peace establishment. The opposition, jealous of a standing army, and anxious to resist war taxation, resented the proposal. Acrimonious debates therefore occupied the winter session of 1697–8; and greatly to William's disgust the estimates were finally fixed for a force of but 10,000 men. To Burnet, who at the time probably approved this decision, William spoke with extraordinary bitterness; declaring himself "weary of governing a nation that was

[1] An obvious reference to his many personal escapes.

[2] The Memorial further proposes that the Commission should consist of four prelates, and ten great officers of state.

"so jealous, as to lay itself open to an enemy rather than "trust him; who...had never once deceived those who "trusted him."

The details of the session need not detain us; but we must notice an abortive Bill of Pains and Penalties, brought against Duncombe, a wealthy Tory financier, guilty of frauds on the revenue incognizable by existing laws. As by this bill two-thirds of his gigantic fortune would have become available towards remission of taxation the danger of the precedent is manifest; and Macaulay regrets the sanction which the attempt obtained at the hands of Burnet and the "excellent...Bishop of "Oxford."

Another matter in which Burnet took keen interest was a Parliamentary retort on the polemics of the Socinians, and of the rather superficial Deism so brilliantly characterized by Mr Balfour. The internecine controversies of the Trinitarians, on which Burnet's *History* expatiates, no doubt gave an impulse to Unitarianism; and it was an attack on the doctrine of the Trinity, published in February 1698, which excited the bill "for the more "effectual suppression of blasphemy and profaneness" accorded, on July 5 following, the Royal Assent[1]. While its fate remained in suspense Burnet wrote as follows, in Latin (under date London, May 27), to his friend Van Limborch.

"I do not wonder that you are so seriously concerned "at our divisions. We have here many wrangling divines, "who but make bad worse. This is a curse common to all "ages and all Churches. But we have now a yet more "urgent cause for indignation. For among us many "openly revolt against Christianity, treating it as a fraud. "These men now-a-days unmask themselves in very bare-"faced fashion, though hitherto they have tried to pass "as Socinians. And even the Socinians here depart "strangely from [the faith] of their brethren abroad...and "frankly encourage Scepticism. They...publish pamph-"lets in which they studiously indoctrinate the populace "with two principles. One is that nothing should be

[1] This Act, though amended in relief of Unitarian controversialists, still remains on the Statute-Book.

"believed which cannot be distinctly conceived. And "thus they insinuate that God must have bodily form, and "be bound by the laws of space; and that matter must "be coeternal with him. Another tenet is, that the eccle- "siastical order, under whatever name or form, is to be "absolutely abolished; so that religion is to be retained with "the status of a philosophy, but not with that of a society. "These opinions they propagate without the slightest "reserve. When so vile a race of men, whose morals "reflect their impiety, openly assault the citadel, it is not "astonishing if the more violent let things slip which we shall "not record. They interpose their whole force to prevent "the passage of a law against impiety and blasphemy; "though men convicted of such crimes are only excluded "from public office, and first offences are condoned on a "profession of penitence. Nor are any under this law to be "condemned, but such as offend of malice prepense and "deliberately. Four sorts of blasphemy are enumerated; "to deny the truth of the Christian Religion, or the "Divine Authority of the Sacred Text; to maintain a "plurality of Gods; or to deny the Divinity of any One "among the Persons of the Holy Trinity. This is the "formal wording of the law and such is the penalty; and "yet many labour vehemently to hinder its passing, and "everywhere cry out against the penalties as a foretaste of "persecution. God knows whither all these things tend. "It is sufficiently clear with what zeal and vehemency our "atheists labour to promote impiety, and how feebly the "friends of religion oppose their efforts...."

Van Limborch seems to have expressed some trepidation concerning the probable effect of the measure; as a few months later we find Burnet responding: "...What you "write to me at large concerning the law lately carried is "worthy of you. The only object of the law was that some "check should be imposed upon the licentiousness of the "irreligious, so as to hinder them from openly venting their "blasphemous fury against religion; which seems urgently "to require repression. But as no single prosecution, thus "far, has taken place under this law, so the law itself is "framed in such a manner, that it may apply to no one on "account of mere opinions, even if he openly maintain

"them; unless he attack sacred things in lewd terms; as "our atheists hitherto have almost universally done, though "at present they act more cautiously rather than more "modestly." Meanwhile the Socinians, in addition to undermining Christian doctrine, "openly argue in favour of "free love, even without the formality of divorce. Such "doctrines, propagated among the crowd, and almost uni- "versally discussed, have produced such a dissolution of "manners as gives us the most melancholy prospect. May "God be merciful to us and deign to avert those evils from "us. Moreover, the clergy are become so corrupt and sunk "in such sloth and ignorance that almost nothing amongst "us seems to remain sound. Pardon a melancholy man "that pours out his thoughts into your bosom."

To other correspondents, meanwhile, he wrote on more cheerful topics. His *Thanksgiving Sermon* of the preceding December had drawn a happy parallel between the Queen of Sheba, to whom its text refers, and the "mighty "Northern Emperor" (Peter the Great) on his way to learn the arts of government at the feet of the Stadtholder-King. During the session just described the Czar had reached England. On the strength, no doubt, of Burnet's multifarious learning—of his interest in the Greek church—and of his proficiency in the Dutch tongue (which the Czar had recently acquired)—the Bishop, assisted by competent interpreters, was deputed by the King and his Episcopal colleagues to offer the great man "such informations of our "religion and constitution as he was willing to receive." Foreign ambassadors commented on Burnet's frequent access, and on the affability evinced by the Czar to the English prelates in general; while Burnet's contemporary correspondence, as compared with his *History*, shows far more appreciation of the man of genius, latent in the savage. Thus on March 19 [1698] he wrote as follows to Dr Fall.

"Since you went the Czar came once to Lambeth, and "saw both an Ordination and a Sacrament, and was much "pleased with it. I have been oft with him. On Monday "last I was four hours there. We went through many "things. He has a degree of knowledge I did not think "him capable of. He has read the Scriptures carefully.

"He hearkened to no part of what I told him more atten-"tively than when I explained the authority that the "Christian Emperors assumed in matters of religion, and "the supremacy of our kings." It is, as Klopp says, a curious question how far the seed thus sown may be responsible for the Church-policy subsequently adopted by the Czar, and for its widely reacting effects.

But dogma, no less than policy, occupied the august controversialist. "I convinced him," asserts Burnet, "that the question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost "was a subtilty that ought not to be made a schism in the "Church. He yielded that Saints ought not to be prayed "to; and was only for keeping the picture of Christ, but "that it ought only to be a remembrance and not an object "of worship. I insisted much to shew him the great "designs of Christianity in the reforming men's hearts and "lives, which he assured me he would apply himself to.... "The Czar will either perish in the way or become a great "man." A few days later Burnet records "...The Czar's "priest is come over, who is a truly holy man, and more "learned than I could have imagined, but thinks it is a great "piece of religion to be no wiser than his fathers, and "therefore cannot bear the thought of imagining that "anything among them can want amendment."

Burnet seems also to have reported the episode to the celebrated Leibnitz, then in the service of the house of Guelph; since on April 5 we find Leibnitz congratulating the English Church in general, and Burnet in particular, on the appreciative attitude of the Czar; whose sympathy might facilitate the introduction of the reformed religion into the neighbouring Empire of China, which hitherto had been abandoned to the missionary zeal of the Jesuits. "Monsieur Boyle," so Leibnitz judges from "l'excellent "sermon funêbre" with which Burnet had honoured his memory, would have embraced this design with warmth; but his pious endeavours must surely have left emulators in both England and Holland. Such hints, as we shall find, were by no means lost on Burnet.

Meanwhile one of Burnet's letters to Fall, already quoted (under date April 5) contains further interesting allusions. We find Burnet thanking his correspondent for

"a most acceptable present...Lord Fairfax's memoirs... "writ...with an air of sincerity and piety." Is Fall's copy, he enquires, really holograph?

But more immediate topics press to the front; for the European situation seemed alarming in the extreme. The King of Spain lay apparently *in extremis*. France and Austria, heirs by blood of the childless potentate, but barred, in the case of the former, by formal renunciation, hovered, as it were, like political vultures on the diplomatic horizon. William, once secretly pledged to Austria, now thought himself compelled by failing health, the critical state of Holland, and the exhaustion of the confederates, to aim at a compromise. Vague rumours of his secret negotiations with France seem to have become current; while the shameless venality which kept guard over the sick bed in the Escurial was more accurately gauged. "We are now," continues Burnet, "in expectations of the King of Spain's "death. The King of France has desired the King's "mediation with relation to the succession to that Crown, "and offers the Duke of Berri. That Crown is like to be "sold by the Council of Spain as that of Poland was last "year. We fall into new discourses of plots and assassina- "tions. Some pretend to make discoveries; the Great Day "will make many. I hope your retirement does not so "entirely possess you as to make you forget those who are "in the crowd and storm...."

Events, in fact, were tending to place Burnet in a position of increased responsibility, and correspondingly increased odium. On the death of the Queen a formal reconciliation had been engineered between the King and his heir the Princess Anne; and by the summer of 1698 her only surviving child, the Duke of Gloucester, was supposed, at the mature age of eight, to require a separate establishment.

Shrewsbury, whom the King would have appointed governor, himself saw the propriety of conciliating the Princess, by selecting, for a post so intimate, Lord Marlborough, husband of her confidant. William, who had every reason to distrust this intriguing pair, for long demurred; and only yielded on finding that the alternative was the appointment of Lord Rochester, uncle to the Princess,

an extreme party-man. But he yielded with unusual, and very politic, grace; admitting Marlborough to political office, and even apparently to favour.

Since Marlborough's connections were rather with the Tory camp, the Whigs doubtless claimed the preceptorship; and Burnet's Revolution sympathies, professional experience, and intellectual reputation, marked him out for the post. But the suggestion was by no means palatable to the Princess Anne. She heartily disliked Burnet; who, in the great struggle of 1692, had shown himself her sister's partizan, and the opponent of the Marlboroughs. Moreover her own choice had fallen on Dr Hooper, who had been at one time her sister's chaplain at the Hague, and who, in that capacity, had incurred William's dislike. Seldom considerate of others, and no doubt regarding the appointment of Marlborough as a sufficient sop to the Princess, William now persisted.

Burnet, on the other hand, was averse from the post, on public no less than private grounds. The latter are easily grasped; even his self-complacency was not altogether proof to the tokens of Princess Anne's dislike. "I had" (he admits) "some intimations that I was not acceptable" to her. Lord Godolphin, indeed (ostensibly at Anne's desire) combatted the Bishop's conviction: "yet," says Burnet, with unusual acumen, "I had reason to believe "there was some ground" for the report. Moreover, in a household composed of Tories and "rigid" churchmen, he could expect little quarter; and though Lord Marlborough, with his accustomed diplomacy, hastened to evince gratification—though even his tempestuous wife expressed a gracious acquiescence—the attitude of the rest of the establishment was singularly hostile.

Burnet's public grounds for hesitation are, *per contra*, rather mysterious. During the six months which had elapsed since his glowing eulogy of William he had "become "uneasy at some things in the...conduct" of the monarch he had lauded. He still considered the King as "a glorious "instrument raised up by God, Who had done great things "by him"; and still acknowledged "such obligations to "him" as compelled a resolve "on [private] as well as [public] "accounts, never to engage in any opposition to him."

And yet, says Burnet, "I could not help thinking he might "have carried matters further than he did, and that he was "giving his enemies handles to weaken his government." To what these cryptic charges refer, we cannot accurately say. Burnet may have resented the King's efforts to retain a standing army; or may have regarded as excessive his diplomatic tenderness for Papists. He may have suspected the influence of the Villiers clan, the family of the discarded mistress; he may have been mortified by the failure of his own attempts to improve the revenue of the clergy. In any case "I had," he says, "tried, but with little success, "to use all due freedom with [the King]; he did not love "to be found fault with; and though he bore everything I "said very gently yet he either discouraged me with silence "or answered in such expressions, that they signified little "or nothing." Dartmouth's comment on this passage is amusing. "King William," he says, "always complained "of Burnet's breaking in upon him whether he would or no, "and asking such questions as he did not know how to "answer, without trusting him more than he was willing to "do; having a very bad opinion of his retentive faculty."

Eventually, Burnet was persuaded to accept the preceptorship; and was on the point of taking the preliminary oaths, when a tragic event gave a pretext for recoil.

Eleven years had passed since his marriage to Mary Scott, which had proved a happy one. "I found in her," says Burnet, "a religious, discreet, and good-tempered "friend, who was a prudent manager of my affairs, and a "very good mistress of a family; and she had a very "particular art of making herself acceptable to all people. "She bore me seven children, five boys and two daughters "that were born twins; two of the boys died....She gave "them all suck and was a tender mother to them all."

As soon as peace had secured the narrow seas, Mrs Burnet realised the necessity of a visit to her native land; for her extensive property, estimated at £30,000, was invested in Dutch securities. She had however (as Burnet subsequently discovered) a presentiment of impending death, which she concealed even from her husband. She made secret but elaborate preparation for the apprehended event; and even managed, without exciting suspicion, to

discuss, in conversation with her husband, the future of their children. The Burnets had a common friend in a saintly and intelligent woman, who had been some years a widow. Mrs Burnet had sometimes described her as a woman fit to be, in the highest sense of the word, the Bishop's helpmeet; and she now, as if fortuitously, let fall a wish that, in case of her own premature death, Mrs Berkeley might be induced to become "her children's "mother."

Her forebodings were punctually fulfilled. She left England May 29; and hardly had she reached Rotterdam ere, "being in a house where the small-pox was," she contracted the infection. The intimation of her illness was almost immediately followed by the news of her death[1]; "je l'ai perdu," wrote Burnet pathetically, "devant (*sic*) que "je l'ai cru malade." To a man of his affectionate nature the shock must have been great; and he appeared "a most "deserted mourner."

Meanwhile, as Burnet himself puts it, he "laid hold on "this domestic affliction," and the necessity for closer attention to the affairs of his young family, as a plea for declining the preceptorship; and "wrote earnestly to that effect" to his "best friends." We trust he does not include among these the wily old apostate Sunderland, who in a polite letter, dated June 29, declines to intercede; "if I have any "credit at all, you...shall be sent for." A more appropriate agent was Burnet's metropolitan, Tenison; whose answer to a second urgent representation is dated June 28. It describes an interview with William, in which Tenison had submitted Burnet's prayer. "The King," proceeds the Archbishop, "expressed himself with great tenderness.... "He still desires you to come as soon as with decency "you can. He looks upon you as a divine, who in such "cases had comforted many[2], and thinks it will look best, "not to suffer such a cross to get such a power over you as "to make you decline so public a service. He spoke to "this effect without my urging my private opinion, which "is what it was....It is true if no steps had been made in "this affair, your excuse would easier have made its way;

[1] June $\frac{8}{18}$, 1698.
[2] A reference to the death of Queen Mary seems to be implied.

"but seeing things are so far advanced it seems not proper "to go back. If upon this, that hopeful Prince should fall "into such hands as are unfit, your Lordship would then "[repent]."

Thus adjured Burnet yielded; and was summoned by express to Windsor. On his first audience, he begged leave to resign his bishopric; on the plea that his new charge must conflict with diocesan duties. The King, "surprised" at this unexpected request, declined to accede; but a compromise was effected. The Bishop, when in London, was to take up his abode for the future at St James's Palace, then in the occupation of the Princess. But William undertook that his nephew should spend each summer at Windsor, within the diocese of Sarum; and that ten weeks should be annually allowed the Bishop for inspecting the rest of his flock.

The emoluments of the post, excluding allowances, amounted to £1500 a year; but these Burnet never touched; the whole was devoted by him to charitable uses. A document is extant, in which Burnet makes arrangements for the distribution of a fifteenth part at the hands of the archdeacon of Berks; since, as Burnet says, "I cannot now "give that constant attendance on...my diocese, which I "ought to do, if I were not engaged in an employment of "great importance." The sum was to be divided in three equal parts; devoted respectively to the needs of the poorer clergy, apprenticeships, and the maintenance of University exhibitions. In both these latter cases the sons of poor parsons were (*ceteris paribus*) to be preferred.

Burnet's own view of his appointment is given in his correspondence with Van Limborch. "The letter [of "condolence]," he says, "which you addressed to me six "months ago, was very welcome to me...under the most "melancholy affliction which has yet befallen me. But so "soon as I had paid those dues to natural affection which it "is hard, and scarce Christian to withhold, I was forced to "embrace other interests. God alone knows what things "are profitable or needful for us; it becomes us calmly to "submit ourselves and all our concerns to His will....Your "congratulations on the charge committed to me with "respect to the Prince's education, show your friendly

"sentiments towards me. I confess this office is a highly "honorable one, on the wise management of which much "depends. I see in the Prince's talents and inclinations "cause for the highest hopes. But alas! what can be "hoped in a Court, which, surrounded by so many "temptations and crowded by so many flatterers, easily "diverts the mind, prone by nature to luxury and ambition, "from the best counsels. I shall take particular care to "place ever before him the best examples. I make "Xenophon's *Cyropædia* my text-book, and have already "twice read that book through with him. I shall also "endeavour to make the names of Alexander, falsely "styled the Great, and of Julius Cæsar, ever odious in his "eyes. Their [example] even from the cradle infects nearly "all princes with distorted principles. I set ever before "him the incompatibility of true piety with superstition "and cruelty. Hitherto everything has gone on as well "as I could desire; but other dangers will arise in a few "years' time, against which I shall studiously prepare every "possible precaution."

In his *History* Burnet has left a detailed sketch of the methods he pursued with his pupil. He supervised the general education of the little boy; taking for his own province (in addition to religion and morals) the interdependent departments of history, geography and politics. The child was old for his age, and learned with surprising facility; and Burnet, like the rest of his generation, failed to recognise in such precocity a danger-signal, the frequent concomitant, indeed, of water on the brain. This deadly disease, which had already proved fatal to many of the *sixteen* infant brothers and sisters who had predeceased the poor child, is intensified by premature application; and Burnet's lessons, though conveyed in the least fatiguing manner possible, being conducted *viva voce*, for about three hours a day, must have proved extremely deleterious.

Of the relations between teacher and pupil but one token remains; a pathetically childish note in which the little Prince acknowledges a "kind letter" from his preceptor, hopes for his return, and signs himself "your most "affectionate friend." The Bathurst family, however, long preserved the anecdote of an ancestor, who had been the

child's play-mate; and who, hinting surprise at the little Duke's civility to the tutor he disliked, received the cruel reply, "Do you think I have been so long a pupil of Dr "Burnet's without learning to be a hypocrite?" Here we may trace a childish recapitulation of the opinions entertained by the majority of the Princess Anne's household.

That the feelings of the Princess herself were softened by intercourse with her son's preceptor, we do not doubt; though it may be questioned whether she ever conceived for him that "peculiar regard" of which his family supposed him to have received "some sensible marks." For if she learned to acquit him of self-will and ambition, she still, it is clear, thought Burnet meddling and officious. Burnet, on his part, who knew nothing of her advances to St Germain, conceived a sincere respect for Princess Anne's domestic virtues. He came to regard with far more leniency her share in the dissensions with her sister. He opined that after Mary's death she showed a dignified self-restraint; and acknowledged that her position, in itself difficult, was rendered none the less onerous by the suspicions of the Whigs.

In her household, however, Burnet gained few friends; and his unpopularity is wittily commemorated in a set of satiric verses which relate to this period of his career. During his tenure of office, alterations seem to have been made in St James's Chapel; where were introduced (as some say, for the first time) the "horsebox" pews which during the century succeeding were to disfigure the parish churches of England. The wits in the following stanzas made Burnet responsible for the change. For, so they tell us,

"When B[urne]t perceived that the beautiful dames
"Who flocked to the Chapel of holy St James,
"On their lovers the kindest of looks did bestow
"And smiled not on him, while he bellowed below,
"To the Princess he went
"With pious intent
"This dangerous ill in the church to prevent;
"'Oh madam!' quoth he, 'our religion is lost
"'If the ladies thus ogle the *Knights of the Toast.*

"'Your Highness observes how I labour and sweat,
"'Their affections to raise, and new flames to beget.

"'And sure, when I preach, all the world will agree,
"'That their ears and their eyes should be pointed on me
. . . . . .
"'But now I can't find,
"'One beauty so kind,
"'As my parts to regard, or my presence to mind
. . . . . .
"'[Pray] build up the seats, that the beauties may see,
"'The face of no brawny pretender but me.'
. . . . . .
"The Princess, by rude importunities pressed,
"Though she laughed at his reasons, allowed his request,
"And now Britain's nymphs, in a Protestant reign
"Are locked up at prayers like the virgins in Spain," etc., etc.

His disfavour with the courtiers of Princess Anne, however, admitted, as we have seen, of two significant exceptions; "I lived very well," he says, "with [Lord "Marlborough and his Lady], and I thought that was "enough."

Burnet, as we are aware, had long been prepossessed against the Churchills, and this on excellent grounds. Now, however, and clearly for the first time, he came under the spell of the most seductive intellect in Europe. Day by day he conversed with the urbane diplomatist, whose charm, to quote Churchill's enemy Chesterfield, neither man nor woman could resist. And all the arts of an accomplished suavity were, it is clear, deliberately focussed upon Burnet.

A man without political interests or political prepossessions, Marlborough was connected with the Tory camp by the rigidly "Church" sympathies of Princess Anne. But the Tories were out of power; and impotent to dispose of the military responsibilities, the military emoluments, which Marlborough so persistently coveted. The Whigs at this moment appeared the more influential party; and Burnet was a Whig nominee.

Eight years later, when the historic coalition between Marlborough and the Whigs was gradually taking shape, Burnet told a Whig minister "why he thought [Marl-"borough and his friends] true to the English" (*i.e.* the Revolution) "interest." The prelate (so writes the Minister) "told me...of...Marlborough's early and most "earnest professions to him (even with solemn oaths and

"imprecations) of his honest intentions." Burnet "was "sure France had tried" both Marlborough and Godolphin; "and yet very early" (before overt action against France) the French "by Bishop Ken and other their "emissaries did what [they] could to blast them." This is clearly an echo of Churchill's specious self-exculpation. And what these calculated blandishments began, good offices were to consolidate, patriotism and party passion to achieve. The gradual stages of Burnet's subjugation can be traced, with absolute precision, in the successive revisions of the *History*.

Meanwhile, during the Parliamentary Session which succeeded Burnet's appointment (and which followed on a general election, mainly favourable to the Whigs) the question of the military estimates became once more acute. Restrained as is Burnet's language, he clearly admits the impolicy of William's attempt to retain the Dutch Guards; which, with his continued devotion to his continental home, and the rumour of secret understandings between himself and France, increased his unpopularity in England.

The summer saw the determination of a notorious *cause célèbre* which still ranks with the "leading cases" of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. On August 3, 1699, after four years' litigation in the Archbishop's Court (Burnet ranking as Assessor), judgment was given against Dr Watson, Bishop of St David's; charged with simony, extortion, and *the issue of false certificates importing that persons concerned had duly taken the oaths to the government.* Watson was a quasi-Jacobite Tory; and his friends represented the prosecution (which aroused the most intense excitement) as a purely party move. The legal issues proved as complicated as important, and some are still regarded as open to question. Watson fought the case with the utmost tenacity; he disputed jurisdiction at every step; and was never weary of appealing. That substantial justice was done we need not doubt. Even Dartmouth, a strong Tory, describes the charge of simony as proved; and scarifies Watson's character, and the motives of his supporters. But we should not care to pronounce, *prima facie*, that Watson's friends had no foundation for their certainly clamourous complaints that he appeared before a prejudiced tribunal.

Whether his judges did or did not show greater leniency to the Whig Bishop Jones, accused almost simultaneously of similar practices, does not greatly matter; for both were eventually deprived by sentence of the Court. But it is certain that Burnet betrayed a decided animus against Watson; and that neither Tenison nor Burnet possessed the judicial faculty. They could not, at will, divorce intellect from passion; or regard the legal aspects of a case in abstraction from all prepossessions, whether moral or emotional, political or religious.

In another episode of this period, however, Burnet showed more impartiality. It has been surmised, probably with truth, that there was not much love lost between Burnet and the philosopher Locke; while Burnet's esteem and admiration for Stillingfleet (by this time Bishop of Worcester) were of very long standing. Stillingfleet some years earlier had animadverted on the religious tendency of Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*; and a controversy had followed, which, during the years 1696–99, had attracted great attention. In this, by general consent, Stillingfleet was badly worsted. Never a match for Locke, on Locke's own ground, his health was now failing; and he committed the unpardonable solecism of charging Locke personally with an explicit belief in every doctrine which Stillingfleet's logic could deduce from the premisses of the *Essay*. On this point Burnet, in a letter to Le Clerc, writes with admirable candour. "What you say," he comments, "of "the Bishop of Worcester...is too true. The dispute was "certainly unworthy of him. There was a gross mis-"representation of Mr Locke's notions, which I hope is "now at an end, though it had been more to the Bishop's "honour that it had never been begun. But every man "does not know where his strength lies. When there is "visibly a design to throw off the Christian religion, a just "zeal against that is apt to raise jealousies both of persons "and things that have no relation to it, but are very "innocent."

No less creditable is it to find Burnet applauding a famous attack by the Nonjuror Collier on the profaneness and immorality of the contemporary English stage.

We must now turn to a very fascinating topic, on

which we have already touched; the intercourse between Burnet and the vast and versatile genius of Gottfried Leibnitz. Ostensibly Librarian and Privy Councillor to the Courts of Brunswick, we may more truly describe him as the focus in which, as his latest biographer well expresses it, "the scattered tendencies and aspirations of "his age united." The correspondence (from which we have already quoted, and which we trace as far back as 1696), arose very naturally. Though Leibnitz had visited England, it is unlikely that the two had met. But they had had common friends in Robert Boyle, in James Johnston, (at one time Envoy to Berlin), in Burnet of Kenmay, a distant cousin of the Bishop's and a kind of "tame cat" in the literary circle of the Electress. Absurd as it would be to rank Burnet, in the sphere of science and metaphysics, with the intellectual giant of his age, the two minds, on political and religious grounds, had a good deal in common. An indefatigable curiosity, an energy equally unwearied, are characteristic of both. The intelligence of either was broad, sane, pacificatory; though in temper of course Leibnitz, the bland and urbane, was more formed than was the impetuous Burnet for the office of peacemaker. On the crucial topics of politics and religion in their day—on the Socinian controversy and on the limits of passive obedience—their matured views coincided; and both, even when discouraged by the attitude of the Hanoverian House, were ardent partizans of a Hanoverian succession.

Burnet, however (the example of Grotius notwithstanding), would hardly have approved that strange secret negotiation for a conciliar solution of the great Western schism, which was encouraged, in view of the Turkish danger, by the Emperor and even the Pope; and of which, during the years 1693–1701, Hanover became the centre, and Leibnitz the actual pivot. By 1695 the hope of success —always, one imagines, illusory—had dwindled almost to nothing. The Gallicans remained obstinate; the Protestants feared a pitfall; Leibnitz was more intent on the English succession; Spinola, the originator, died. Yet the subject of œcumenical or pseudo-œcumenical Councils retained for Leibnitz a special fascination; and the interests of a friend, engaged on a history of the Council of Constance, seem

to have originated in 1697 his correspondence with the historian of the English Reformation.

Meanwhile, in 1697, the diplomatic arrogance of Louis XIV had dealt a crushing blow to the irenical project. The famous Fourth Clause of the Treaty of Ryswick, inserted, at the last moment, on the threat of an immediate rupture, had abrogated, in favour of the Roman Catholics, the provisions of the Treaty of Westphalia, so far as this related to the restored provinces on the Rhine. The alarm and indignation of many Protestants recoiled upon the Emperor, by whom the terms had been accepted; while even the pacific Leibnitz, though he had resumed the negotiation with Rome, and was willing to countenance somewhat startling dogmatic concessions, seems to have practically concentrated his aim on the consolidation of Protestantism within the Empire.

About the end of 1698, in answer apparently to a missing Latin epistle, he draughted, in French, a remarkable letter to Burnet. Therein he informed his correspondent that the Court of Brandenburg had at heart a union of the Protestant confessions, and that a secret negotiation had commenced at Berlin "dont je suis l'entremetteur, en ayant "même donné l'ouverture." Discretion be regarded as essential, till the Lutheran chiefs should be pre-engaged; else contests might arise, which the Romanist party would foment. The Lutheran theologians of Brunswick he considered the most suitable mediators; since they had long since refused to condemn the Calvinists outright. Meanwhile, even Brandenburg realised that proposals peculiar to that Court might arouse jealousies in the North. This plea however could not be raised against a project endorsed by the English King. Moreover "les théologiens de "l'Église Anglicane passent pour les plus modérés des "Réformés" (Calvinists) "et pour les plus approchés des "nôtres," *i.e.* the Lutherans; while several English Bishops "*comme aussi l'Université d'Abredon*[1]" (Aberdeen) "et "plusieurs docteurs célèbres de votre île se sont expliqués "d'une manière que donne les plus grandes espérances." The King, on the eve of his return to England, had been initiated; had approved the design; and had referred the matter to Portland.

[1] Omitted in the printed version.

The conjuncture Leibnitz thinks a happy one. Negotiations set on foot mid the troubles of the Thirty Years' War had dropped with the Westphalian settlement; but now that France has hurled an "apple of discord" into the Empire; now that the Romanists, relying on her, try to extend the incidence of the Ryswickian Clause, till at this rate there will scarce remain a Protestant beyond the Rhine, it behoves more than ever that Protestants should unite. But it must be so done, as not to alarm Vienna and Versailles. Let the King, he suggests, broach the matter to a small Committee; including perhaps Burnet, Tenison and Portland.

Then follows in the draught of the letter a paragraph never actually sent. In this Leibnitz had intended to point out, how important it was for the interests of Protestantism in Europe that the English reversion should be fixed on the indubitably Protestant Hanoverians. As a matter of fact, though Leibnitz may not have known this, the sudden treachery of Savoy to the Grand Alliance had alone diverted William from the scheme of a Savoyard succession. By the end of 1696 Leibnitz seems to have been cooperating with the King in sounding the sentiments of the Electress; and, as these proved still uncertain, William, just before the date of this letter, had, as Leibnitz tells Burnet, broached the topic to the Princess. The King, however, thought fit to defer the publication of his views; might it not be well to strengthen his hands by manœuvring an address on the subject from the House of Commons? In writing this Leibnitz no doubt contemplated forcing the hand of his still reluctant mistress. On consideration however, such action appeared to him too bold; and the passage was finally cancelled. With a graceful allusion to a letter, in which Burnet had informed the Electress of his recent loss, and which had consoled her in her own affliction for the death of her husband, Leibnitz therefore concluded. A postscript observed, that Leibnitz answered in French the Bishop's "belle lettre latine," for the sake of some, to whom it might be desirable to show the communication: but that he understood English sufficiently "pour "pouvoir recevoir vos ordres en cette langue."

Burnet accordingly answered in his own tongue dating from St James's, the 17th February O.S. 1699.

"Most honoured Sir,

"Since you are pleased to allow me the liberty of "writing to you in our own language, I willingly lay hold "of it. I do not wonder to find all languages so familiar "to one of so comprehensive and universal a genius. Very "often those who deal in many things are slight and "superficial in them all; but it is a very singular character "to know so many things, and to go so profoundly to the "depth of everything. By your last I see your zeal and "application to the concerns of our common religion. The "truth is, we divines, who should preach up the obligations "to charity and peace, are so eager and so set on the "maintaining of parties, and the supporting those notions "that we are engaged in, that I am afraid we are not "capable of healing the wounds of the Church; we are liker "to make the breach wider than to heal it. In particular, "most of the Lutheran divines write with a fierceness that "does not become the meekness of Christ. It is true those "of your parts have been much more moderate since "Calixtus' time. I am glad to understand from so good "a hand that the dangers which seem hanging over all our "Churches do dispose men to hearken to wise and healing "counsels. I have laid the contents of your letter before "the Archbishop of Canterbury and some of our Bishops, "who are very glad to see that men come to a better "temper. You are not pleased to tell me in what manner "the expedient now offered is set forth; whether only as "a civil and political union, or as a conjunction of the "Churches in one Communion; and whether that is offered "at, leaving all parties to their several opinions; or if "some consent of doctrine among them is agreed on. If "this method is taken I doubt it will have no good effect; "for neither side will yield, and the falling on some formula "capable of equivocal senses will lay an imputation of "deceit on both sides and cannot continue long. The "only way, in my poor opinion, to establish a good corre-"spondence among you, is to follow the method that we "have followed so happily in England. As to the manner "of the Presence we do only reject Transubstantiation; but "leave the rest free to Divines to explain or illustrate it

"as they please. Some contend for a real, others for a "figurative Presence; but this makes no quarrel among "us. And as for the point of Predestination our Articles "do indeed favour S. Austin's doctrine, yet not so formally "but that men of other persuasions may with a good "conscience sign them; so though the greater number "among us receives that doctrine commonly called Arminian, "yet some there are, both Bishops and others, who are for "Absolute Decrees; but we do all not only hold one "Communion but live in great love and friendship together, "notwithstanding that diversity of opinion. Some method "of this kind is that which must heal the breach among "you, or it must be given over as desperate and incurable. "When you think fit to let me know more particularly the "state of the negotiation among you, I will communicate it "to the Archbishop, who will lay it before the King, and "do everything in his power by which he can contribute to "so good a work...."

As this proposition came to nothing, the chief interest for us lies in its possible influence upon the final revision of Burnet's great work on the Articles, published in the Michaelmas term following.

For seven years that work had remained in manuscript; it had been submitted to the criticism of Tenison and Sharp, of Stillingfleet and Patrick, of Hall and Williams. "It lay," says Burnet, "some considerable time in both "Universities, and was read by many, all approving of it"; though some dissuaded him from publication fearing malicious retorts. At length, when the Peace of Ryswick had brought Anglicanism once more face to face with Continental Romanism, he determined to publish his *Apologia pro Ecclesia sua.*

In the preface to this *magnum opus* Burnet claims rather the character of a historian and compiler than of a substantiate author. He has aimed at resuming the intellectual result of post-reformation Anglicanism; laying stress upon the great men of their respective epochs. In especial he enumerates Jewel, "the lasting honour of the see in which... "God has put me"; Reynolds, Humphreys, Whitaker, Whitgift, Hooker, the Archbishop of Spalata; Laud, whose anti-Roman treatise "writ with great learning, judgment

"and exactness" is second only to that of Chillingworth; Pocock and Lightfoot; Hammond and the great Pearson; while among later divines Stillingfleet is given the preference.

Respecting *Subscription*, he emphasizes the apparent hardship of compelling expressed allegiance to so complicated a body of doctrine. He traces the causes which lead to an elaboration of dogma, and the special circumstances which compelled the Reformers to dissociate themselves alike from Roman superstition and Antinomian license. In respect of the laity, he argues, the Articles are but Articles of Peace or Communion; the clergy however are bound, in conscience, to a complete assent and consent. Yet where the Articles are really ambiguous they may be honestly signed by men of varying views.

Theologically, the *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles* will be judged by the prepossessions of its readers; but all may agree to eulogize its literary merit. In the lucid condensation of theological argument Burnet has few equals; and the historical summaries (which trace the progress of opinion on each several topic) are models of succinct expression.

The main interest of the work centres on the Predestinarian controversy. To it his attention had been specially directed by Queen Mary, whose sojourn in Holland, with the explicit Calvinism of her husband, lent it in her eyes a peculiar prominence. Moreover, as we have already hinted, the irenical projects of Leibnitz may, at the last, have intensified Burnet's interest on this head, and induced a double stress on his original aim. This was, so to set out the arguments on either side that all might realise the inadequacy of human intelligence, and the need for mutual forbearance on so recondite a subject. Unanimity or even a *formula concordiæ* he thinks impossible. But the common *credenda* which underly both theories may be thrown into relief; and men may learn that an honest divergence of view need be no bar to communion.

For such a part Burnet was peculiarly fitted. His own conversion from Calvinistic views had been gradual, and had not entailed the violent revulsion of feeling so often implied in such a change; he could not abhor the doctrines to which Leighton had always clung. His treat-

ment of the Calvinistic position therefore is extraordinarily calm and candid; full justice is paid to its nobler aspects; and in his preface he prides himself on the fact, that several, who had read the *Exposition* in manuscript, remained in doubt as to his own prepossessions. These, he allows, "follow the doctrine of the Greek Church from which "St Austin departed." This doctrine, and that of the Arminians (though not identical with the dogmas held by the compilers of the Articles), are, he considers, compatible with their "grammatical sense."

A few minor points are of autobiographical interest. On the *damnatory clauses* of the Athanasian Creed Burnet observes that doubtless some errors, as well as all sins, are damnable; but errors (as well as sins) of *ignorance*, are included in a *general* repentance. *Original sin* (the *fact* of a "corruption...born with every man") he regards as patent in *Experience*; the conclusion, that corruption cannot emanate from the Divine, as patent to *Reason*. His curious saying, that Adam's brain was a *tabula rasa*, suggests a study of Locke. As regards the *scope* of redemption he argues that men, though not saved *by* the law they profess, may be saved *in* it; that though Christ be the only channel of mercy, an explicit knowledge of the fact cannot be indispensable to salvation. The *endlessness of hell-torments* (questioned by his friends Tillotson and Leibnitz) is unequivocally asserted; but we find the curious admission that the purgatorial texts cited by the Romans might be more validly urged against the doctrine of an endless hell. *Prayers for the dead* Burnet classes among practices (such as the administering of the Eucharist to infants) which, though neither scriptural nor primitive, are yet of high antiquity; and have been abandoned solely on account of attendant abuses. He admits the arguments which may be paraded in favour of *auricular confession*, especially when left (as it is by "our Church") a "matter of advice "and not of obligation"; but dwells on the absence of warrant for universal compulsion, and the grave dangers which outweigh the apparent advantages of the practice.

On the *Sacramental* question he deprecates equally the attitude of the Roman, who regards the Sacraments as a charm; and the contrary extreme "of sinking the Sacraments

"so low as to be mere rites and Ceremonies." Rather, they are federal; pledges, badges, and channels of Covenanted Grace. Baptism brings men within the Covenant; but does not, he opines, remove the corruption of the flesh, which is ineradicable. The *presence of Christ in the Eucharist* he describes as "real" but not "corporal." Against the Romanist he urges, with terrible effect, the saying of Augustine, that the actual devouring of Christ's flesh and blood would be a revolting fact; the difficulties which confront devotees of the "new" Philosophy, who have abandoned the mediaeval metaphysics on which transubstantiation relies; and the futility of the perpetual miracles maintained by the Papists. For the spiritual results they deduce are claimed as well by the advocates of a purely spiritual presence; while the Roman is saddled with the dilemma, that a man may actually eat the Flesh of Christ to his own damnation. Yet, were the error merely speculative, men might bear with it, as with Lutheran consubstantiation; ranking them together as fragments of false philosophy. It is the practical effects of the transubstantiation theory which have become intolerable.

Respecting the *marriage of the clergy* his attitude is somewhat unexpected in so much a married man. For while he maintains, in the strongest fashion, the criminality of imposing on the clergy an unwarranted restriction; while he enlarges on the horrible results of enforced celibacy as displayed in mediaeval immorality; he admits that from comparatively early times the marriage of men actually in orders had been regarded with disfavour. Leighton, Nairne and Charteris may have risen before him, when he himself gives preference to the unmarried parson; who lives as a "burning and shining light," under no temptation to sacrifice his profession to his family.

We must now, however, consider the reception of the work. The enthusiastic approbation of Leibnitz goes without saying: "j'y trouve," he wrote, "un système de "théologie en abrégé des plus nerveux et des plus profonds, "et que plus est, des plus modérés et des mieux conduits." The interests of the reconciliation project had led him to study, with especial care, the articles on predestination and the Eucharist: "parce que ce sont les principaux points qui

"divisent les protestants....J'ai lu avec grand plaisir com-
"ment le fort et le faible des deux partis est représenté dans
"votre commentaire." The part of the *Exposition* which relates to the 17th Article had been, he adds, published at Berlin in a Latin translation; no doubt with a view to the irenical project.

In England, Burnet declares, "for a while all were silent "about it. They who on other accounts set themselves "against me, when they saw it generally well received "were for a while at a stand." Their disapproval was none the less deep. The witty Dr South, for instance, complained that the Bishop had administered to the Church "forty stripes save one." Such men, says Burnet, "thought it a presumption for any single person to "expound the doctrine of the Church. They did not "like a latitude of sense in which I had expounded the "Articles, chiefly those that related to Predestination.... "This had been more excusable if it had come from "Calvinists, for the words of the Articles do plainly favour "most of their tenets; but it was very strange when it "came from Arminians, and shewed they would even "wound themselves to thrust at me." That which they most resented was "that I had not carried Church power "higher; that I had owned the foreign [Protestant] "Churches to be true Churches, and that I had so flatly "condemned the [corporal] presence in the Sacrament." Burnet carefully read the many attacks which appeared; but he thought none of them important; and only answered one—an anonymous attack on his explanation of the Second Article. This he attributed to a non-resident clergyman of his own diocese; who (Burnet suggests) might be better employed in looking after his flock than in criticizing his bishop.

To the summer of 1699 belongs an interesting and pathetic letter, addressed by Burnet to his friend Dr Fall. As a nonjuror, Fall had retired from the Rectorship of Glasgow University, and had been collated in 1697 to the precentorship of York. The letter is dated Windsor Castle 25 July 1699; and shows how much Burnet clung to the friends of his youth.

"I read yours with relation to our pious and worthy

"friend Mr Aird[1], with a very sensible concern. It would "only give indignation against those spiteful men for their "attempt on the good name of so exemplary a person, "if he were of a temper strong enough to bear their "malice with the just contempt that is due to it. But "every man has not that brawny *callus* upon him as to "false imputations that God has blessed some with. I "confess all the lies and calumnies of your friends the "Jacobites, whether in print or discourse, have never been "able to raise in me one uneasy thought. But good Mr "Aird is not so insensible; and therefore I have a hearty "tenderness for him, and a true sympathy with him. "Calumny went yet higher against our blessed Master; "and then we have the seal of our discipleship, when we "can drink the bitterest cup that our heavenly Father puts "in our hand, saying, 'Father, not my will, but thy will "'be done.' I confess it is an amazing meditation with "relation to the methods of Providence to see two such "men as Mr Charteris and Mr Aird, of whom the world is "not worthy, to suffer in their old age, the one so much "agony and pain[2] and the other to suffer ill-usage, poverty, "and reproach; while a poor wretch who deserves not to "carry their shoes after them, is overset with plenty, has a "health of so melancholy a firmness that it does not yet "bend under fifty-six, and has a name, God knows, far be-"yond what he deserves. Alas! have I received my good "things in this life, while they have received their evil "things? The other half of the sentence sets me a "trembling. I hope I have a share in their intercessions; "and this is one of the things which I do every day hold "up before God with some comfort. For though I have "little reason to hope that my poor and dead prayers "should be heard, I have great reason to hope that their "help is of good use to me. Thus we see daily many new "proofs of the unsearchable depths of the providence of "God, and of his counsels which are past finding out. "Let me know if I can be of any use...to that good man,

[1] Mr Aird, for whom see *supra*, p. 93, had become a Jacobite; and lay, among the extreme Presbyterians, under a charge of Popish proclivities. [Note courteously contributed by Mr Clarke from Scott's *Fasti Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*, Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 604.]

[2] Mr Charteris was a martyr to the stone.

"and assure him of all the tenderness and friendship that "I am capable of; I hope you do not forget one who never "forgets you."

During the summer of 1699, a curious, and rather inexplicable incident comes to our notice. Robert Harley (a son of Burnet's old friend, Sir Edward), who combined the, to us, very incompatible positions of Speaker of the House of Commons, and head of a somewhat miscellaneous Parliamentary opposition, perused, with or without their author's privity, Burnet's "secret" Memoirs; drawing from Burnet's summary of post-revolution politics material for the ensuing campaign against the existing administration, which proved unusually violent.

Disillusioned Whigs and embittered Tories contributed almost equal contingents to the forces of discontent; and all the passions and resentments which had accumulated at compound interest during the continuance of the war, and had been exasperated by the disbandment dispute, now discharged themselves with redoubled violence upon the Stadtholder-King and the Whig camarilla at the helm.

"If" (wrote Burnet to the Electress February 27, 1699–1700, three months after the commencement of the Session) "if I had found matter such as might interest or "amuse your...Highness, I had tried to make use of it, in "return of [your] favour [dated] 11 January last. But "matters do not go so well, that a man can take pleasure "in telling them, or hearing them told. I often compare "the King and the Parliament to a man and wife, of whom "the happiest have some ill moments; but they always "remain friends at last and forget the past; the root of "the evil [being] that neither studies the humour of the "other. So the King does not sufficiently apply himself "to the temper of the nation, which is open, and doth not "love coldness and reserve. This, joined to the frequent "absences of his Majesty from England, occasions much ill-"humour. Residence is as necessary for a King as for a "Bishop; and the Republicans make use of these journeys "to conclude, that the nation already dispenses with a "King for half the year....Our House of Commons has "been driven, by the continuance of violence from the "French side, to pass severe laws against papists; which

"will drive them hence in a few years, if things remain as "they are...."

In effect, the peace had but increased the sufferings of that miserable Huguenot remnant, which still, under the ægis of a pseudo-conversion, clung to the land of its nativity. Moreover the cessation of hostilities had opened our ports to a swarm of Jacobite exiles, many Papists, and some of them priests. Other priests followed in their wake; and their demeanour (as Evelyn notes, and Klopp allows) was at times distinctly provocative. Reports became current that the Treaty of Ryswick contained a secret proviso, in favour of the Roman Catholic religion; and these rumours derived some support from the very well grounded suspicion, that William, out of deference for his Papist allies, had reduced to a minimum the execution of the Recusancy Laws. An absurd legend even arose, that, like his uncles, he tended towards the Church of Rome. From such fears and such jealousies sprang the tyrannical Bill to which Burnet refers; and which, besides specific clauses directed against Roman priests, was framed so as to bar from all rights of succession to real estate popish minors who should refuse to conform on their majority.

The Court party in the Commons, aware that the move was intended to embarrass the King, and relieved by the Peace from the necessity of considering Vienna, turned the tables on the promoters by supporting the Bill. Hereupon, says Burnet, the original patrons recoiled; and clogged the Bill with such "severe" and "unreasonable" provisions as might induce the Lords to reject or amend. But a majority in the Lords—including Burnet (who on March 14 took the chair in the Grand Committee) and all his brethren save one—swallowed every clause; fearful lest the slightest amendment should wreck the chances of the measure.

"I," says Burnet, "was for this bill[1], notwithstanding "my principles for toleration, and against all persecution "for conscience' sake. I had always thought, that if any "government found any sect in religion incompatible with "its quiet...it might, and sometimes ought to send away "all of that sect, with as little hardship as possible.... "The dependance of those of that religion on a foreign

[1] And for subsequent yet more drastic proposals.

"jurisdiction, and at present on a foreign pretender to the "crown, put them out of the case of other subjects, who "might differ from the established religion; since there "seemed to be good reason to consider them as enemies "rather than as subjects....This Act...would put those of "that religion who are men of conscience upon selling their "estates; and in the course of a few years might deliver "us from having any papists left among us." He only laments that the Act—as we are relieved to learn—proved a dead letter; and longed for the Act to be amended in a more stringent sense. Such a policy—though defended by Burnet from the days of the "Popish Plot" panic—is really worthy of a Procurator of the Holy Synod. The Popish terror was in fact becoming Burnet's obsession; and, within certain limits, he showed the harshness born of fear.

And if this was his attitude in the "green tree" of English tolerance, what can we expect from the "dry "wood" of Irish alarms? We are shocked rather than surprised to find Burnet (who only hoped for the improvement of that country through "the total depression of "the Irish") subsequently applauding the disgraceful "penal" legislation by which Protestant ascendancy was nullifying the Treaty of Limerick, and sowing the wind of nineteenth century whirlwinds.

Meanwhile Ireland was before the Houses upon another account. A recent Commission of Enquiry into the disposition of the Irish forfeitures had revealed enormous grants to the King's Dutch favourites, and his former mistress, Mrs Villiers; the value, actually large, being grossly swollen by rumour. Opinion in England became strongly excited; and, in the interest of the tax-payer, a Resumption Bill, marred by crass injustice to individuals, was rushed through the Lower House; which then attempted to force the hand of a reluctant Upper Chamber, by "tacking" the obnoxious measure to a Bill of Supply.

Burnet, unlike the majority of the Peers, had from the first favoured the Bill. For to him it seemed merely an act of severity against *the King*; his sympathy with whom was in this case largely qualified. Some of the grants (as he caustically observes) "had not been made on good and

"reasonable consideration." In other words, we presume, Burnet, the loyal servant of Mary, was scandalized by the wealth thus heaped on her former rival. He approved indeed upon principle of the *amendments* which the Lords (in defiance of custom) introduced into the more objectionable clauses. But he argued, cogently enough, that the Commons had public feeling on their side, and would only be exasperated by resistance. He even stood up to the King himself, when William (who at first determined to fight the matter out) remonstrated in terms of asperity with the refractory prelate. "I said," declares Burnet, "I would venture his displeasure rather than please him "in that, which I feared would be the ruin of his govern-"ment."

In effect, the Commons refused to yield; while the Lords stood equally firm. Passion rose to fever heat; and civil conflict really seemed to impend. The crucial moment came; and on the 9th of April (to quote the language of Dartmouth) "London was in an uproar. Westminster was "so thronged that it was with great difficulty anybody "got into either House. The Lords had insisted and "adhered; so there could be no more conferences; and all "seemed under the greatest distraction." He describes with singular vividness the anxious manœuvres which followed; the King's reluctant surrender; and the awful moments of tension which ensued, when the ministerial Lords, their blood well up, ignored the signal for capitulation. But the deadlock which threatened a tragedy came to a farcical conclusion. Tenison, on positive commands from the King, rose and left the House, "beckoning" after him sufficient of his suffragans to ensure a majority for the Bill. The situation was thus saved in the very nick of time.

Throughout the crisis, Burnet had been keenly excited; and at one moment, his rude interruption of a brother Peer had nearly landed him in the Tower. His relief at the issue became, however, more dubious when he realised the flagrant injustice of the clauses he had helped to condone; and he firmly resolved never again to concur in a "tack on "a Money Bill."

Meanwhile the distracted Session had not passed without personal embarrassment to himself. At the beginning of

the forfeiture debates in the Lower House, the expenses of the young Duke's household came under discussion. The pretext had brought Burnet's enemies at once to their feet; the incident of the *Pastoral Letter* had been recalled, and a motion had been proposed for the removal of so improper a preceptor from the person of the future King. The House, eager for sport, had risen to the bait; and on December 13, with a disrespectful allusion to his Northern origin, the motion had been actually made. His friends had urged his services to the "Protestant religion and "English liberty"; had specifically adduced the *History of the Reformation*; and had touched on the impolicy of exasperating Scotch opinion, already infuriated by news of the Darien disaster. Burnet's enemies, however, had forced a "snap" division; only to be beaten by 173 to 133 votes. The Bishop, it is clear, had a real hold on the House; but the size of the majority is otherwise explained. Marlborough, who, as Macaulay neatly observes, had himself a "past" which would not bear inspection, feared a Whig retort on himself. He had therefore "whipped up" the presumably languid sympathies of the Princess Anne's household; and had thus established a fresh claim on the gratitude of the warm-hearted preceptor.

The immediate result of the Session was the disgrace of the Lord Keeper Somers. He had become, partly on account of the strange piracy episode, the magnet of opposition hostility; and William, who thought him supine in the forfeiture debates, avenged himself by throwing him to the lions. Some anticipated a similar fate for Burnet. In any case, wrote a Tory, the Oxford colleges under the See of *Winchester* (where a vacancy seems to have been expected) need not fear *Burnet's* visitation.

The sinister prominence given to the Villiers' connection in the course of the forfeiture debates may explain the vehemence of Burnet's attitude towards an episode which immediately followed. Early in May, a clergyman had been recommended to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (with the sanction, we presume, of the King) whose character would not bear inspection. On the 23rd of the same month the Archbishop communicated to the Board a letter from one of the Secretaries of State. Brother to

Elizabeth Villiers, Lord Jersey was in politics a Tory; and his somewhat curt missive intimated the King's pleasure that a prebend should be conferred on Jersey's own chaplain. This candidate seems to have been unexceptionable; but the appointment expressly contravened the terms of the Commission, which specifically forbade the Secretaries to approach the King, without the previous sanction of the Commission. Patrick and Sharp, however, opined that if the King chose to override his own instructions, the Commission could only acquiesce. Bishop Moore of Norwich, a fresh member of the Commission, urged, on the other hand, the evils of such interference, and thought these should be represented to the King. Even should his Majesty insist on the appointment of Jersey's chaplain, the Commission must demur to the previous and objectionable appointment. Burnet took yet stronger ground; on May 25 he wrote to the Archbishop from Salisbury in the following indignant strain:

"May it please your Grace:

"I hope your Grace looks on this letter as the "superseding our commission, and that accordingly you "will carry it to the King and deliver it up; for I am sure "this destroys the effect of it. I wish your Grace had "maintained your ground upon the first attack. But now it is "too late to struggle, if this person is not quite laid aside "and an effectual stop put to all things of this kind for the "future. We are under much obloquy already; I am sure "we will become justly so if we are only to screen the "recommendations of a lewd Court. Howsoever, for my "own part, I beg leave to be left out, if your Grace thinks "fit to continue the Commission on such terms. I thought to "have writ to your Grace on other subjects, but I will mix "nothing with this, that I may leave your Grace with full "freedom to shew it, or make what use of it you please. I "am with all duty and respect" [etc.].

On the very same day he signed at Salisbury another paper, which related to an ecclesiastical problem rapidly becoming acute.

The eleven years' intermission of Convocation had been bitterly resented by the "rigid" majority among the clergy,

which was now occasionally designated as "High Church"; and which saw the Presbyterian Assembly in Scotland voiced by its General Assembly, while the English Church found its official spokesmen in the Spiritual Peers, whose views were hardly representative. Under such circumstances, this majority had rapidly declined from the Erastian professions, which in truth cohere awkwardly enough with extreme ecclesiasticism. From 1697 onwards, it had argued for an independent right of holding synods, inherent in the Church; and in the animated controversy which ensued, Burnet had become himself involved. His answer to the first and anonymous edition of Atterbury's *Rights...of an English Convocation* was, as we hinted above, dated from Salisbury, May 25, 1700; and contains an unequivocal reassertion of Burnet's own Erastianism. In every State there can exist but one supreme Executive, and one supreme Legislature. Parliament, and "the Magistrate" must rule; all other powers are subordinate. Obedience to the Civil Power is thus incumbent on all; until its command encroach on "the law of God"—*i.e.* on the moral law, and the universal precepts of the Gospel. In matters purely ecclesiastical the clergy should be *consulted*; their *consent* is not essential.

Such views, so pointedly expressed, did not enhance his popularity among the inferior clergy.

Yet concerned as was Burnet in administrative and ecclesiastical problems, he was none the less keenly alive to the wider issues of professional activity; none the less interested in the new elements which religious zeal, here and abroad, was finding for its energies. The "very "pathetic discourse" which Burnet on March 25, 1700 preached "before the Lord Mayor" and a great congregation at St Mary-le-Bow "to the Societies for the Reforma- "tion of Manners," introduces us to this aspect of his career.

From about 1678 onwards there had arisen in England (probably as an offshoot from the German "Pietistic" movement) a number of "Religious Societies." These were in a measure akin to the pious fraternities of the Middle Ages—to the "guilds" of modern ecclesiastical organization. They aimed at deepening the devotion of their members, no less than at their association in external

good works; and furnished the model of the original "Methodist" Society of some forty years later. Under James II the revival of Protestant zeal lent them impetus; but they were not confined to one school of Protestant thought. "Things of that kind," says Burnet, "had been "formerly practised only among the puritans and dis- "senters; but these were of the Church, and came to their "ministers to be assisted with forms of prayer and other "directions....After the revolution, these societies grew "more numerous...they got such collections to be made as "maintained many clergymen to read prayers at so many "places, and at so many different hours, that devout persons "might have that comfort at every hour of the day; there "were constant sacraments every Lord's day in many "churches; there were both greater numbers and greater "appearances of devotion at prayers and sacraments, than "had been observed in the memory of man."

The movement, which he strongly approved, had several important offshoots. From about 1691 we trace the rise of those societies for the Reformation of Manners (or, as we should say, Vigilance Societies), to which Burnet's sermon was addressed. These promoted a stricter execution of the laws against vice and immorality; and though they had been encouraged by Queen Mary, and are said to have had some effect in enforcing public decency, the methods they pursued aroused much adverse comment. Some lawyers censured their interference as irregular and officious; and many parsons deprecated co-operation with dissent. Burnet's sermon, however (mentioned above), does not treat of legal interference; and dwells rather, in sensible and animating fashion, on the value of Friendly Reproof.

Another outcome of the more strictly religious movement was the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Established in 1698–9 as a central link between the local Societies, it even managed to keep in touch with Continental Pietism. Its own direct mission was the religious education of the English masses, then almost incredibly ignorant; and the "Propagation" of Christianity "in the "Plantations." Its double aim appealed strongly to Burnet, who had always displayed the educational energy even then distinctive of the Scot, and who shared the anxiety of his

adored Queen Mary for the ecclesiastical welfare of the Colonies; in June 1700 he joined the Society, as its third episcopal member. When moreover, in 1701 an offshoot of the Society specially devoted itself to the "Propagation of "the Gospel" the departure evoked in Burnet a sympathy, which was fully shared by Leibnitz. The latter hastened to urge on Burnet his own favourite scheme for the evangelization of China, in emulation of Jesuit energy. Burnet was not unmoved; for when on February 18, 1703–4 he preached to the new organization an eloquent and manly sermon, his animadversions on the missionary apathy of the English Church, and the spiritual needs of the dependencies, introduce an interesting sketch of the Jesuit propaganda, its characteristic virtues and defects.

Nor was Burnet's interest in religious evangelization and religious revival confined to his own communion. The Quaker schism in America (which occasioned the secession of his old friend Keith to the English Church) attracted his attention. He was by no means indifferent to the controversy concerning Justification which distracted the Independent Churches. To German Pietism he refers in sympathetic terms; the progress of Molinism in Italy had for him a perennial fascination; and he followed with keen appreciation the dispute as to Quietism (then raging between Bossuet and Fénelon), to which Leibnitz had drawn his notice. A fear of incurring the dreaded charge of mysticism keeps his language guarded; but his sympathies were evidently with Fénelon.

His interest in all religious phenomena was probably quickened by an event which took place during the summer of 1700. On March 11, White Kennett, dining with the Bishop, found it "no great secret in his own family" that he contemplated, in the fifty-seventh year of his age, and the second of his widowhood, a third marriage.

For such a step, the reasons were admittedly cogent. He had no near connection, who could with propriety preside over his establishment. "I had," he says himself, "five children, the eldest...but ten years old when his "mother died; and being now" (as Gloucester's preceptor) "to live in a Court,...it seemed necessary to provide a "mistress to my family, and a mother to my children."

It is, in fact, probable that the intermittent domestic administration of a busy impulsive man had not conduced to the good order of the Episcopal household. A position of undefined responsibility in the Palace seems to have been held by a Scotch couple named Tofts; concerning whom Mr Clarke observes, that a schoolmaster with this patronymic had left Saltoun when Burnet resigned the charge. They had a daughter named Katherine; beautiful, fascinating, and dowered with a magnificent voice. It is possible that the kindly employer had extended to the wayward genius a rather ill-judged patronage; and when, somewhere about 1700 she left the Palace (under circumstances which do not seem to have reflected credit on the discipline of the establishment she quitted) to become the most brilliant of contemporary English opera-singers the Tory-Jacobite gutter-press found a theme for scandalous variations. To these we must refer later on. Here we shall only make the incidental remark that the virulence of Jacobite libel upon Burnet almost exceeds belief. Hearne (himself a highly reputable man) does not shrink from insinuating that Burnet, in the days of his episcopate, was capable of insulting propositions to a woman of rank and character; and that his conduct on first taking orders (when he seems in reality to have lived the life of an ascetic), might justly have called down the curses denounced on the sons of Eli, and the inhabitants of the Cities of the Plain.

To the Tofts scandal Burnet, as is natural, never refers. He suggests, in fact, that the domestic motives for his remarriage might not have prevailed with him "if I had "not known one of the most extraordinary persons that "has lived in this age."

Elizabeth Berkeley, born Blake, was eighteen years younger than the Bishop. Married at the age of 17 to a man her intellectual inferior, and fearing, on the accession of James II, pressure from his papist relations, she had persuaded him to travel; and at the Hague had become acquainted with the Burnets. The Revolution had brought the Berkeleys home; and when, four years later, Mrs Berkeley had been left a childless widow, she had dedicated her time and wealth to offices of friendship and charity. She it was whom Mary Burnet had so pathetically suggested as a step-mother for her children.

Mrs Berkeley, however, had no wish to remarry. In a curious "Reflection" on the subject, extant in manuscript, she says: "My temper and genius never affected a married "state, which was first an act of obedience to my parents, "and now an act rather of my will and understanding than "of passion or inclination. I considered the circumstances "of the person I chose made it, as far as I could judge, "best for him to marry; with respect to the age of his "children, the place he then held in the Court; which for "one of his free and generous conversation and good "nature, free from cunning or design and so easily imposed "on by those who had, made a sincere and faithful friend "of great advantage; and though I wanted all other quali- "fications I thought myself capable of sincerity, and of "preventing sometimes too hasty impressions of others, or "errors of inconsideration, which ill-designing men might "(unwarily) engage him in. Also I hoped, I might have "more power to do good in a more public post; so if I "have descended to a lower place, as a second marriage in "its own nature ever appeared to me to be...it was out of a "too great desire to serve my brethren."

The marriage seems to have taken place in May or June 1700. Men remarked that Mrs Elizabeth Burnet, like her predecessors, was not ill-dowered; her income being estimated at from £600 to £800 a year. The Bishop, however, with his usual disinterestedness, left this sum at her disposal; and after paying into the episcopal coffers the equivalent of her personal expense, that the Bishop's power to do good might not be straitened by his remarriage, she devoted the remainder (some four-fifths of the whole) to acts of beneficence.

The experiment seems to have proved eminently successful; for the new Mrs Burnet was no less amiable than she was intelligent, ardent, and devout. The two daughters she bore to her second husband died in infancy; and her motherly affection settled on the offspring of her predecessor. "Both I and my children," says Burnet, "were happy in her beyond expression; for she was one "of the strictest Christians, and...most heavenly minded "persons I have ever known. Her *Method of Devotion*," he adds, touchingly, "gives her true character; she prac- "tised it all as well as she wrote it." On this work,

Overton, though prejudiced against her husband's school, delivers himself in the language of eulogy. It is, he considers, one of the few fine devotional works which the age produced.

Yet more interesting are the lady's fragmentary memoranda preserved in the Bodleian Library. They are mainly religious; for Mrs Burnet was of those for whom religion lends to life its only real zest. There was in her the makings of a mystic devotee. With great sweetness and modesty she touches on the writings of the Fénelon school. "I remember" (she says) "when very young, so soon "as I began to think of religious matters, some of these "thoughts did as [it] were spring up in my mind, I knew "not how; for I found them not then in books; but my mind "found rest and quiet in them...and when I first met with "them from men of piety and learning, my heart was glad, "...and I feel as it were their certainty." Actually, however, a strong intellectual bias, sound common sense, and a sedate English environment, kept her raptures within bounds. Her memoranda, together with very fervent piety, evince breadth of judgment, and some mental originality; while her study of the Dutch enthusiast, Madame Bourignon, is a model of discriminating analysis.

But if her influence fanned in her husband the flame of an exalted devotion, it had also a more mundane result. For Elizabeth Burnet, on religious motives, was a staunch political partizan. To her, the Revolution spelt salvation from the toils of Rome; of which, despite wide tolerance, and friendship for individual Romanists, she entertained a profound dread. In the preface to the posthumous edition of her *Method* (a preface for which her husband admits ultimate responsibility), her political zeal is described as the one thing in her "that looked like excess." Patriotic apprehension "preyed" on her spirits; and sometimes even "set too great an edge on them." No mollification of her husband's increasing partizanship could be expected from her.

Nor was her party fervour without historical importance. In the Duke of Gloucester's household she came into contact with Lady Marlborough; and fell, as the Princess Anne had herself fallen, under the strange spell

which surrounded that imperious and very mundane beauty; whose religious orthodoxy, except as regards hatred to Rome, was more than open to question. The attraction seems to have been mutual. If Mrs Burnet's letters to Sarah are couched in fervent terms, the great lady, on her part, condescended to give, for her new friend's satisfaction, a self-exculpatory account of the strife between the royal sisters; of which the insinuations obviously affected the Bishop's later narrative. And to the influence of Mrs Burnet we may with likelihood ascribe the Whig vehemence by which Lady Marlborough so seriously jeopardized her husband's later career.

Brief however was to prove the official intercourse between the ladies; for within two months, the preceptorship suddenly determined. On the occasion of his eleventh birthday (July 24, 1700) the young Prince, after the manner of little boys, ate too freely of the dainties provided. Fever supervened; doctors crowded in; the poor child was "bled, cupped, and blistered" out of an always frail existence; to be buried with all the gloomy solemnities of a great State Pageant.

For his death spelt a national calamity. The King's health was visibly declining; the Princess, if but in her thirty-fourth year, had never boasted a robust, or even sound constitution; and though she had, the preceding spring, given birth to a still-born child, and cherished, it was known, subsequent abortive expectations, the hope that she would leave issue was thenceforth practically abandoned. James II drew near his end; the Electress was advanced in years; and the Stuart claimant, Papist in religion, a foreigner by breeding if not by birth, practically confronted the Lutheran ruler of a growing German principality, who by no means relished his proposed responsibilities. As late as September 1700—nearly two months after Gloucester's death—William III vainly sought for some sign of Hanoverian acquiescence in the proposed Hanoverian settlement. The Electoral House, in fact, was but forced from its attitude of reserve by the critical state of another dynastic problem.

The King of Spain was at length actually dying. Louis XIV (intent, all renunciations notwithstanding, on

the great inheritance) had driven, by his secret Treaties with William, a wedge into the Concert of Europe. The first Treaty, mainly favourable to a third claimant, had been frustrated in February 1699 by his premature death; and in May following the two contracting parties had demanded the Emperor's concurrence in a second Treaty, by which Spain, the Indies and the Netherlands should have fallen to the cadet of Austria; the Italian Provinces to France and her nominees. The wrath of Vienna, treacherously fomented by France, focussed itself upon the "honest "broker," who, in the interests of the Sea-Powers, had not only bargained away the rights of a former ally, but had assigned to him the Provinces he least coveted. Louis, however, with diplomatic parade, had declined the advances of Austria; and had ostentatiously published (May 1700) the terms of the Partition Treaty, which had become known in England early in the month of June.

The English nation not unnaturally started at finding itself concerned, without its own knowledge, in so drastic a rearrangement of the map of Europe; with the almost certain responsibility of paying the eventual bill. The good faith of France was strongly, and with reason, suspect; while the extension of direct French influence over Italy was dreaded by the powerful commercial interests involved in the trade with the Levant.

What Burnet himself thought of these Treaties cannot be certainly known; for the language of his *History* is evasive. The subject certainly absorbed him; he obtained information on the subject from all whom he thought could throw light, including William himself, who proved unusually loquacious. Burnet even, as he tells us, succeeded in getting a sight of the parchment of the second Treaty. Probably he ranked with those who feared the transformation of the Mediterranean into "a French lake"; and who only hoped the King of Spain might survive till England, recovered from her exhaustion, might be mistress of the European situation. The King of Spain, however, neither fulfilled these aspirations nor acquiesced in the dismembering of his Empire. His own sympathies were Austrian; but Vienna proved weak and vacillating. Meanwhile the threats of France and her creatures were ostentatiously

backed by the silent rhetoric of French armies, massed on the Pyrenean frontier; and when, on November 1, the King of Spain died, it was found he had devised the whole of his vast dominions—Spain and the Indies,—the Netherlands and the Italian provinces,—to a grandson of the French King. Louis for but a week retained the mask of hesitation; and the Spanish Empire, without a blow, submitted to the Duc d'Anjou.

Europe shuddered at the shock; and William, outmanœuvred, and driven to bay, turned with his usual stubborn resolution "to see what could be done." In silence the indomitable Dutchman, ready as ever to "die "in the last ditch," set himself patiently to work to reweave the European coalition. But he assumed the veil of indifference; for in procrastination lay his only chance.

The existing outlook seemed hopeless. William had at last learned that the English must be *led*, not driven, nor conducted blindfold; that he must work through public opinion and not in its despite. And yet all parties were at the moment averse from war; preferring even the elevation of a Bourbon cadet, to the terms of the Partition Treaty. Moreover the existing Whig Ministry, unpopular in the country, could not even command a majority in the House of Commons. The King, to gain time, prorogued Parliament till the spring; and meanwhile entered into negotiation with the heads of the Tory majority. Its leaders were admitted to the Privy Council, and various offices; and their terms included, besides a dissolution of Parliament, the session of Convocation which the High Church clergy desired. Their demand was granted, and writs issued simultaneously for the two elections.

"And now," writes Burnet in his *History*, "I am come "to the end of this century, in which there was a black "appearance of a new and dismal scene; France was...in "possession of a great empire[1]...while we in England, who "were to protect...the rest, were by...factions...running into "a feeble and disjointed state...[and were] become very cor-"rupt in all respects...the nation was falling under a general "...dislike of the King's person and government; and the

[1] This, though not absolutely true in theory, represents the practical issue. See Klopp, *Fall des Hauses Stuart*, ix. 42, 48, 172–5, 378, 444.

"King, on his part, seemed...weary of us and our affairs; "and...falling...into a lethargy of mind[1]. We were... "become already more than half a commonwealth; since "the government was plainly in the House of Commons, "who must sit once a year...[and] the Act for triennial "parliaments kept up a standing faction in every county and "town in England. But though we were falling insensibly "into a democracy, we had not learned the [necessary] "virtues...luxury, vanity, and ambition increased daily, and "our animosities were come to a great height....Few "among us seemed to have a right notion of the love of "their country;...the House of Commons, how much soever "its power was advanced, yet was much sunk in its credit... "the balance lay chiefly in the House of Lords, who had "no natural strength to resist the Commons."

In reading these gloomy vaticinations, we have to remember the possibility that in their present form they date from some years later; when Burnet inclined to regard with a jaundiced eye all that bore the Tory stamp. For the result of the elections, as Burnet informs us, was a substantial Tory majority, both in the House of Commons and in Convocation; though it is clear from other reports that a very large number of members of Parliament could not be specifically ranked under the banner of either party.

Ere Parliament could meet however, the situation was modified in two important particulars.

For, in the first place, the urgency of the Continental crisis, and the necessity of keeping England, at least, from the hands of a dependent of France[2], was sapping the reluctance of the Hanoverian House. William, who saw the full importance of settling the English succession, renewed his efforts; until the instances of Leibnitz and others had wrung from the Electress a letter which, with a little straining of its terms, might be interpreted into a promise to be guided by William in the matter.

And, in the second place, about a month after Christmas, French troops suddenly occupied the fortresses of the

[1] For the curious intrigues by which William, in order to divert suspicions of his designs, was fostering this belief, see Klopp, ix. 98–101, 109–19, 137.

[2] Which had fomented the opposition to the recognition of the Ninth Electorate.

Spanish Netherlands; the "Barrier" of the United Provinces, the key to the English Channel.

Such was the situation when, on February 10, the King met his Parliament. In his speech he recommended the further settlement of the Succession, necessitated by the death of the child-Duke; and expressed a hope that Parliament would seriously consider the Continental crisis.

The latter question was the first which came under debate. The Tory party showed itself strongly biassed against war; on which Burnet ill-naturedly observes, that French gold was unusually current in London during the winter of 1700–1. But while the use of such means was in accordance with French practice, the factor may, in this instance, be dismissed as inconsiderable. Foreign relations had less interest for the squires and the clergy, to whom the Tory leaders mainly appealed, than they had for the mercantile classes; who feared, and with justice, that Louis aimed at monopolizing, for the merchants of France, the lucrative trade of Spanish South America—the so-called "South Sea" trade. Yet on the other hand war taxation always pressed, with exceptional severity, on the landed and clerical interests. The trend of events, however, forced from the Lower House a handsome naval vote; and a request that the King would contract alliances, calculated to preserve England, Holland, and the general peace of Europe. The Upper House called for papers relative to recent Treaties; and elicited the surprising intelligence that not a single document was producible concerning the Partition Treaties, which had never been discussed in Council. The wrath of the House flamed out against the Ministers concerned, however formally, in these clandestine and unpopular negotiations. But the Tory majority, with a cynical partiality which Burnet justly reprobates, concentrated its resentment on Lord Portland, and the Whig grandees; ignoring the complicity of Lord Jersey and Marlborough who ranked more or less as Tories. The impeachment of Portland and the Whig Lords became abortive, in consequence of a disagreement between the two Houses; but in the interval "I," says Burnet, "bore "some share in those debates, perhaps more than became... "my station and other circumstances." Holding as he did,

however, that "by our constitution all foreign negotiations "[are] trusted entirely in the Crown" he was "convinced "of the innocence of the Lords" and "thought the govern- "ment itself was struck at" by these invidious proceedings. His own speeches were marked by extreme asperity, and he treated his brother Bishops with special incivility.

The episode left its mark on the eventual revision of his *History*. Indignant at the treatment meted out to Portland, for whom ever since the Revolution he had entertained a hearty dislike[1], he subsequently deleted from his Memoirs a number of disparaging comments on the conduct of the Dutch favourite.

Meanwhile the Succession Question had been rapidly settled. A few days after the meeting of Parliament Leibnitz had written an anxious letter to Burnet, which urged the merits of the Electoral House, and the immediate necessity for counteracting the influence of France. Such arguments were indeed cogent; and since the Tories at this time, despite Burnet's ill-natured insinuations to the contrary, were almost free from Jacobitical leaven, and more cordial adherents than the Whigs of the Hanoverian House, the issue could not be doubtful. During the debates in the Upper House Burnet himself showed "a very particular "zeal"; and on June 12 an Act settling the Crown (though with some invidious conditions) on the Electress Sophia and her descendants was presented to the King by Speaker Harley and received the Royal Assent. A gracious letter from the Electress acknowledged Burnet's efforts.

Burnet's account of these debates, as we have already remarked, is not very candid; since he endeavours, perhaps under the influence of subsequent prepossessions, to rob the Tories of their due. He shows more impartiality in the frank praise he lavishes upon a Bill which was levelled against the gross abuses then attendant on Parliamentary privilege; though the Bill seems to have had its rise in a private Tory interest.

The concurrent ecclesiastical session did not edify the world. In truth the spirit of Atterbury—a spirit fearless, factious and imperiously litigious—animated the Lower House. The proceedings commenced with severe reflec-

[1] Cf. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 196–7 and *supra* p. 222, with *supra*, p. 260.

tions on the Bishops, and degenerated into unseemly wranglings between the Houses, in which the Lower House was invariably the real aggressor. As Burnet remarks—and his language will find an echo in the mind of the average layman, religious or irreligious—it is "strange to "see men who...assert...the divine right of episcopacy," so little submissive to that order. At last matters reached a deadlock; communication between the Houses ceased. "Hereupon," says Burnet, "[the majority in the Lower "House] being highly incensed against me, censured my "*Exposition of the Articles*"; as favouring "a diversity of "opinions which the Articles were framed to avoid"; as containing matter inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church, dangerous in consequence, and derogatory to the honour of the Reformation. Burnet begged that the Lower House might be compelled to formulate these charges; but the deadlock continued. The King however refused to gratify the majority by dissolving the Ecclesiastical Commission.

Bitterly enough wrote Burnet to his friend Van Limborch. "I have read [your] life of Episcopius[1] with "much pleasure. What [evil] times that great man fell "upon! [His adversaries[2]] were divines indeed! The "breed seems unchangeable. When they have a majority "they extol to the skies the powers of Churches and "Synods; sed mutatis temporibus, mutantur et illi. Among "us there rages almost the same exasperation. Our "Churchmen, hitherto the least violent section of the "Reformed [Churches] seem to set before them the example "of the others. Whither all this will tend, God knows. "They eye the Toleration askance, as a certain danger to "the Church, and rage against all who uphold it, as public "enemies. Nor do the overwhelming dangers under "which we are all but crushed, commend to them milder "counsels. We are already in great straits; but I will not "prophesy evil, though I dare not prophesy good."—

"Thus" (says Burnet in his *History*) "ended [a] session "of Parliament and Convocation which had the worst "aspect of any...during this reign."

[1] The then recently published *Latin* translation of the original Dutch version.

[2] At the Synod of Dort.

As we have already suggested however the animus of a later date may tinge this gloomy retrospect. A more cheerful spirit certainly transpires in a contemporary letter to Leibnitz, dated June 30, and despatched with the embassy which carried over the Act of Settlement. "I am "glad," writes Burnet, "that [my *Exposition*] is like to be "of some use in order to the softening the sharpness that "is among your Divines, particularly in the matter of "Predestination. The Court of Brunswick is now so "entirely united to ours upon the justice which the King "and Parliament have done in declaring the right of "Succession, that I hope we shall agree in this, as well as "in everything else, to promote an agreement among all "that are enemies to Popery, in order to the defending "ourselves against the common enemy. The present state "of affairs opens to us a great crisis; for either the King of "France will arrive at the much longed for Universal "Monarchy; or by grasping at too much, as Spain did "above an age ago, he may fall under a feebleness like "that to which we see Spain now reduced....Our Parliament "here has ended much better than was expected. The "practices of the French were as visible here as in many "other Courts, and have been so skilfully managed that "we have been much embroiled by them; yet the genius "of the nation worked so strongly towards a war, that it "could not be resisted...."

These last words exactly reflect the situation. For the nation in general, and the more or less independent vote in the Commons, though slow to grasp the seriousness of the Continental crisis, had gradually taken fire. The "Kent," "Legion" and "Warwick" petitions had forced the hand of Harley and his followers; and the Lower House, at the close of the Session, had emitted positively war-like addresses. Yet the characteristically "War" party suspected this enforced bellicosity and feared indirect manœuvres; the Austrian successes in Italy, where hostilities had already commenced, increased the tension of public feeling; and petitions for the dissolution of the too-lethargic Parliament poured in from the provinces.

William had obtained his "mandate"; and on $\frac{\text{Aug. } 27}{\text{Sept. } 7}$ 1701, the Second Grand Alliance, through which England, the States and the Emperor bound themselves

to secure, by pacific or warlike means, the *satisfaction* of the Austrian House, and the *security* of England and the United Provinces, in respect of both territory and trade, was silently signed at the Hague. Marlborough represented England; for William, under a presentiment of his own doom, aimed at associating with himself, in each stage of the great work, the soldier-diplomatist whose genius he at length realised, and whose wife's ascendancy over the Princess Anne marked him out as the coming man.

Ere France learned the fact, Louis (whose arrogance, designed to cow the Powers, had but goaded them into community of action) consummated his own imprudence. On $\frac{6}{17}$ September James II (of whom, in this connection Burnet writes with charity and candour) died at St Germain; when Louis, in defiance of his pledges at Ryswick, but perhaps relying on the family feeling of Princess Anne, acknowledged the thirteen-year-old "Pretender" as King of England. A storm of indignation swept across the country so cavalierly assigned to the ruler it had just repudiated; the Universal Monarch (men cried) parcelled out, in advance, his provinces. Encouraged by fresh petitions William now dissolved and Louis once more unconsciously seconded his efforts by drastic proclamations directed against English trade. The natural result followed; and the House of Commons which confronted William, when on $\frac{\text{Dec. } 30}{\text{Jan. } 10}$ he opened the Session with an impressive appeal for unity, proved (though rather Tory than Whig) enthusiastic for the war.

The gage of Louis was now flung back in his face. A Tory leader moved that the maintenance of the Protestant Succession should be made an Article of the Grand Alliance. An Oath abjuring the Pretender was imposed on all officials; and Atterbury bitterly complained that in the course of debate "my good lord of Sarum" represented this oath to be as necessary for the support of the existing government, as was any article of religion for the preservation of the Christian Faith.

The first act of the great European drama had reached its culmination; but its protagonist was borne from the scene in the moment of triumph. On February 21 an accidental fall gave the final shock to a constitution

already exhausted; an unlucky chill supervened. On the 4th of March William had a violent shivering fit which Burnet, who stood near him, thought very ominous; and by the morning of Saturday the 7th he was evidently sinking fast. Tenison and Burnet were admitted to the dying man and remained with him to the last. He intimated, though with difficulty, a wish to receive the Eucharist, which was administered about five o'clock on the morning of Sunday the 8th. After the final parting with Benthinck, which Macaulay so pathetically describes, the agony began; and, at eight o'clock, with the last words of the prayer commendatory, he passed quietly away. Twined round his arm like the relic of a saint was a strand of his wife's hair; from his neck, like a talisman, depended her ring.

The character of the Stadtholder-King, with which Burnet concludes his reign, is, like most of the characters contained in the published version of his *History*, a catalogue rather than a portrait. It is, however, conspicuously just; and shows remarkable acumen. For Burnet, who respected rather than loved the husband of Queen Mary, was not here the sport of prepossessions which so often obscured his judgment. On one point, which had a good deal exercised his conscience, his language proved unhappy. An unwonted delicacy—due perhaps to the memory of Mary—forbade him to blaze abroad her husband's infidelity; and yet, as he told Lord Dartmouth, some things were too notorious to be ignored. In the *History* Mrs Villiers is not mentioned; but a cautious reference to "secret" vices —(signifying, as the original context shows, that William had eschewed the *open* profligacy of his uncles)—assumed a sinister aspect in the light of Jacobite slanders.

For the rest, says Burnet, "after all the abatements "that may be allowed...he ought still to be reckoned among "the greatest princes that...history...can afford." His death, so far as his own person was concerned, fell out, as Burnet thought, in a good time for his fame; since the success or failure of the great League he had engineered must equally redound to his credit. As regards the public, however, the verdict is necessarily different. "His death would have "been a great stroke at any time; but in our circumstances "...it was a dreadful one."

CHAPTER X.

REIGN OF ANNE—HANOVERIAN ACCESSION—DEATH OF BURNET—CONCLUSION. 1702—1715.

Le Roi est Mort; Vive la Reine!

"As soon" (sneers Dartmouth) "as the breath was out "of King William (by which all expectations from him "were at an end) the Bishop of Salisbury drove hard [from "Kensington] to bring the first tidings to St James's; where "he prostrated himself at the new Queen's feet, full of joy "and duty; but obtained no advantage over the...Lord of "the Bedchamber...whose...office it was; besides being "universally laughed at for his officiousness."

Burnet was quite the man to appreciate so dramatic an errand; while his former place in the new Queen's household rendered it appropriate, and even decent, that he should hasten to pay his respects. Actually, however, we may regard him as the representative of the Archbishop, whose health, less robust than his own, may have suffered from so prolonged a strain.

Parliament met the same afternoon; and meanwhile the Privy Council waited on the new Sovereign. Burnet reports the agreeable impression produced by a charm of voice and enunciation, in which Queen Anne foreshadowed a later Queen; and by the "gracious" attention accorded to "everything that was said," which contrasted strongly with the dryness of Queen Anne's predecessor. Her first speech to the Council he describes as both "well considered" and acceptable. She expressed "great respect to the memory "of the late King, in whose steps she intended to go; for "preserving both Church and State in opposition to the

"growing power of France; and for maintaining the suc-
"cession in the Protestant line." If she promptly revoked the Ecclesiastical Commission of her predecessor, this had been anticipated and did not call for surprise.

That day week, in the ordinary course, it became Burnet's office to preach the first sermon addressed to the new Queen. His discourse was strictly "occasional"; founded on the text which describes Queens as the nursing mothers of the Church. A brief appropriate eulogy of the dead King was followed by a still briefer, and very graceful, allusion to his successor. "If there was anything "wanting, we may justly hope that the soft and affectionate, "the tender and healing part is reserved for her"; while the well-tested piety of the new ruler's private conversation receives appropriate commendation. As regards more public matters, good government (it is insinuated) implies in its external manifestation "good" alliances and their forcible maintenance. Domestic concerns evoke reference to the great ecclesiastical spoliation of the sixteenth century, when "not only what was wrong[ly] given was "swallowed up," but much that could have been better applied. This hint evinces Burnet's continued solicitude for the great project of re-endowment, in whose interest he had already enlisted the sympathies of the Princess; and which was soon to take form in Queen Anne's Bounty. With delightful simplicity he hints that Solomon had need of sagacity "*for Saul's party was very strong*"; and the subsequent course of the reign lends a certain pathos to his earnest appeal for unity. Let men, he pleads, cast aside "faction and clamour, censure...and animosities, and every-
"thing that may interrupt the harmony that ought to be the "glory, and is the strength of every nation." Strange words to usher in the distracted reign of Anne!

At the moment when Burnet so spoke the nation was represented by a Tory House of Commons, and a Ministry predominantly Tory. Mr Sichel has lucidly defined for us the Tory of 1702; his creed was the "compatibility "of the Revolution settlement *with the preponderance of "the Church and the Land.*" But towards the close of William's reign the spokesmen of the squires and the clergy —who had always distrusted the King, and felt the burden

of war taxation—had demanded Retrenchment, Peace and Reform (of the Royal prerogative). The insolent ambition of Louis had forced the party into war; and the accession of a Queen whose associations were all with them, healed the breach between the Tories and the Court. Moreover, as next in succession to the dubious Prince of Wales (her sympathy with whom was very strongly suspected) she rallied to a considerable degree the loyalty of the semi-Jacobite Tories. This greatly increased the apparent scope of the party; but diminished its effective strength. For the new recruits, if loyal to the Queen in possession, were ill-disposed to the existing Hanoverian settlement; and the seeds of a fatal division were thus effectually sown. Moreover, these ill-starred allies were in every respect extreme; and their disintegrating influence upon the discipline of the party (which had never been very good), proved not only ruinous to the Tories, but a grave national danger. Few things are more prejudicial to any country than a faction led by its "tail."

These dangers, however, were at this period remote. The Tories, moreover, enjoyed for the moment the powerful support of Lord Marlborough; who, in right of his wife's influence over the Queen, appeared, as William had foreseen, the Grand Vizier of the hour. His character therefore formed the pivot of the political situation.

Patient, self-controlled, and eminently humane, Marlborough was none the less in nature essentially cold. But two "grandes passions" stirred the even current of his blood. To his wife he was devoted; and he ardently desired to found a great family. Dynasties, sovereigns, principles, parties and peoples only interested him in so far as they subserved this aim; even War and Diplomacy were for him but avenues to fortune. The Continental command (already conferred by William and of course confirmed by the Queen), had thrown his self-interest into the scale of war; and a strong War-Ministry was therefore his great desideratum. Such a Ministry, at this moment, could only be furnished by his old associates the Tories, to whom moreover the new Queen personally leaned.

The remaining Whig members of the Ministry were therefore gradually superseded by Tories zealous for the

war. Matters, however, remained somewhat in suspense during the first six months of the reign. For, by a recent Act, the existing Parliament and Convocation were so long retained "in being."

Burnet's attitude during this interval is best illustrated in his correspondence. Just after the formal declaration of war, which took place on May $\frac{4}{15}$, 1702, Leibnitz had written to Burnet. "Nous ne pouvions," he had said, "être mieux "consolés de la mort fatale du roi, par rapport à l'Angle- "terre, que par les démarches de la Reine, pleins de sagesse "et de zèle. Comme elle désabuse bien des gens prévenus "contre elle mal-à-propos, elle confirme entièrement le juge- "ment que Madame l'Electrice en a toujours fait. Dieu "veuille qu'elle puisse tenir la balance comme il faut entre "les partis!" He only wishes—how quaint the aspiration sounds—that the King had left on the field, no less than the throne, an adequate successor! He somewhat anxiously reviews the military position; and trusts the danger of the general situation will further ecclesiastical union. He expresses a hope that the existing administration will not favour too exclusively the High Churchmen; whose predominance should not be pressed to the point of actual intolerance.

Six weeks later Leibnitz had written again, to announce that Mr Burnet of Kenmay[1] (while travelling in France for his health) had been arrested and committed to the Bastille; the arrest, as was supposed, being partly due to "le nom illustre qui lui devoit faire honneur." The Electress, Leibnitz added, had at once interceded for him at Versailles, through her niece the Duchess of Orleans.

To these letters Burnet responded as follows from Salisbury under date August 2:

"I hope you do forgive my not answering your "most obliging letter brought me by Dr Sands. Some "affairs are of too tender a nature to bear much discourse; "and therefore I hope you are so good as to pardon my not "enlarging on them. We are now engaged in alliances "and embarked in the war. The succession is as well "secured as laws and oaths can make it, and our Queen is

[1] See *supra*, p. 360.

"both wise, just, and good[1], so that we have all reason to "hope for a good event of things. It was a very good "prologue to the war which the Elector and the D[uke] of "Zell began at Wolfenbuttle[2], and has had very good "effects in keeping the North of the Empire united. We "hope our fleet shall have the like success in the South; "but I engage too far. I must stop that I may give you "my most hearty thanks for your concern in my cousin's "imprisonment in the Bastille. I had only heard of it "before, but without any certainty about it. I beg you will "give my most humble thanks to her Electoral Highness "for the grace and favour she showed him in writing to the "Duch[ess] of Orleans on his behalf. I cannot learn "anything about him, or whether he is still in prison or not; "for as soon as I am rightly informed of that I will humbly "move her Majesty that he may be demanded at least for "some of the prisoners that our privateers have taken. In "the meanwhile I am very sensible of the great obligation "you lay on me by your friendly zeal in this matter...."

To the Archbishop of Canterbury, some ten days later, Burnet wrote as follows:—"I send you with this a letter "...with the draught of the new liturgy preparing in "Switzerland and already in use in Neuchatel. I thought "it a matter of too great importance to write any answer "to it, till I had laid it before your Grace....I have also "a long letter from Mr Turretin much to the same purpose "with a proposition for uniting the Lutherans and the "Calvinists which he thinks would receive much strength "if the Church of England would promote it; in which "he thinks Prince George [the Queen's husband] can "do great service[3]. God knows we are not at present "united enough among ourselves to have much credit "about [*sic*]. In the next place I must beg your Grace's "orders as to my coming up. The Session is to begin

[1] At this moment indeed the personal popularity of the Queen was at its height; as she had voluntarily surrendered for the purposes of the war the sum of £100,000. For the reason see Klopp x. 51.

[2] See Klopp, *Fall des H. Stuart*, x. 45. The Dukes of Wolfenbüttel were arming on the side of France, when their territory was occupied by their kinsmen of Celle and Hanover.

[3] For the connection between the liturgy and reunion schemes see Klopp's *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Electrice*, iii. 341. Prince George was a Lutheran.

"early ; but the first fortnight there is so little to be done, "in the House of Lords especially, that I do not apprehend "the necessity of being in Town by the 8th of October. "But this I submit to your Grace....I hope you will not call "me up unless you see the service of the Queen or of the "Church required....I did not at all meddle [in the elec- "tions for Convocation] for I thought by your last you did "not advise it."

The General Parliamentary Election meanwhile had not only confirmed a Tory majority in power, but had shown the increasing influence of the extreme Tory section. As the autumn advanced it became known that its leaders contemplated a frank electioneering move. The Sacramental Test Acts (which excluded from office the stricter Protestant, as well as all Papist, dissenters) had been frequently evaded by the laxer or more liberal Presbyterians. Among these it had become usual to qualify for office, by communicating with the Church of England, while still retaining communion with a sect; a practice thrown into relief by the bravado of a dissenting Lord Mayor. The virtuous indignation of the Tories resented an equivocation which brought to the Whig ranks a certain number of recruits ; and severe penalties were now threatened against the obnoxious subterfuge.

Early in October, ere Burnet had left Salisbury for London, Edmund Calamy, the distinguished Presbyterian (at this time attached to a chapel in Town) happened to visit Salisbury, in hopes of composing a local ecclesiastical squabble. His *Abridgement* of Baxter's *Life and Times* had just appeared ; and had evoked from Burnet a courteous letter of appreciation. Calamy was therefore "very willing to wait "upon his lordship if he knew how to be introduced into "his presence." A brother-minister, with whom he had discussed the point, gave a hint to the Bishop's Steward, who promptly responded ; and next day took Calamy with him to the Palace. The visitor found himself welcomed with "great frankness," and enjoyed, he says, in the episcopal study "some hours" of "free conversation." The Bishop (proceeds Calamy) "was pleased to thank" his guest for the Baxter *Abridgement* which he "had read with "pleasure" ; and he added, says Calamy, "that as I had

"set the case of the Dissenters in a better light than he had "ever seen it set in before, so he thought it would be very "unworthy of them for whose sake I had taken so much "pains, if they were not very grateful to me." The "Con- "vocation" debates, we surmise, still rankled with the author of the *Exposition*. "The Bishop then spake very "handsome things of Mr Baxter and his writings; only he "with freedom discovered his great dislike of the multitude "of his distinctions, which, he said, created confusion, "instead of giving light. His practical works he much "extolled, and told me, he must own, that if he had any "acquaintance with serious vital religion, it was owing to "his reading them in his younger days; which I heard, I must "own, with pleasure....Among other discourse, he asked "me, what apprehensions we Dissenters commonly had" of Burnet's own *Exposition*; and he instanced especially the Predestinarian points, which had "cost him a great deal "of pain." Calamy hesitating, Burnet persisted; "he knew "those whom I was most conversant with, were the more "moderate sort of Dissenters," and he was therefore "par- "ticularly desirous to know their sentiments." Thus adjured, Calamy admitted that while "very thankful to "his lordship for his pains, and for his charity to those "of different sentiments...they could not but be surprised "to find that...he should quite overlook the middle way... "where truth commonly lies." The *via media* had been in this instance favoured by Baxter; and (at the Synod of Dort) by Davenant (Burnet's "learned" predecessor). "This," adds Calamy, "led into a pretty close discourse of "two hours' length." For Burnet argued that the middle way, logically pressed, leads to the Arminian hypothesis. The discussion, though conducted "with great freedom "and without heat," left the disputants, as Calamy inno- cently observes, exactly where they began. "We had "also," he adds, "a great deal of free discourse upon "the obligation that Christians may be under to compliance "for the sake of peace in things that cannot be proved "absolutely unwarrantable. His Lordship declared it for "his principle that in such things, a regard to peace should "carry it; and strenuously endeavoured to support it. I, on "the contrary, endeavoured to prove that if this was carried

"too far, it would as inevitably bring in slavery into the "Church, *as the doctrine of passive obedience and non-* "*resistance would do into the State.* So that on this point "also his lordship and I could by no means agree. But "his frankness and openness were very pleasing." The impending Occasional Conformity Bill formed an obvious topic of discourse; and Burnet, while minimizing the importance of this attempt, seems to have accepted the natural report, that the Queen's husband (who, though a professed Lutheran, had qualified himself by Occasional Conformity for the office of Lord High Admiral) would vote against the Bill. In fine, says Calamy, the Bishop "in- "vited me to come and see him...at Westminster...to talk "over such things...more freely and fully; and discourse "...sometimes upon public occurrences; which might be no "way disadvantageous; and I must own the motion was "not disagreeable."

Parliament met on October 20 and the much canvassed measure was duly introduced. A singularly unwise essay the Bill proved to be. For though an additional Test, obliging intended officials to declare themselves *bona fide* members of the State Church, might have been represented as the logical outcome of the existing Acts, and their systematic infringement; and though the Opposition (unless prepared to denounce the Test) would thus have been placed in a dilemma; the draught actually introduced went much further than this. Existing occasional conformists were *ipso facto* cashiered; and fines of £100, increasing at the rate of £5 a day, to be doubled on a second conviction, were imposed on delinquents. Under such circumstances the Dissenters could, with some justice, complain that, despite the Toleration, to attend a meeting-house became "occasionally" a crime. The Queen and Ministry however (carrying Marlborough at their chariot wheels), exerted all their influence in support of the Bill.

To Burnet, the principle of such "Occasional" conformity seemed in its essence repulsive; for he believed, as he had argued with Calamy, that nothing save terms of communion rejected as sinful can justify ecclesiastical dissent. But he fully realised the impolicy of the measure; and joined with those Peers who made the proposed penalties

a plea for wholesale amendments in Committee. The House endorsed these amendments; but under pressure from the Queen and from Marlborough the unfortunate Prince of Denmark found himself dividing against them. It is said that the reluctant voter, as he followed his mentor into the lobby murmured ruefully to an opponent "my heart is "*vid* you."

A Free Conference became necessary. It was fixed for January 8; and Burnet was selected as a manager for the Lords. The night before it took place (mindful of Burnet's invitation) Calamy repaired to the episcopal lodgings at St James's Palace. He was accompanied by a fellow-minister, who, while settled within Burnet's diocese, had "sometimes waited" on the Bishop and had been "always "well received." After a very civil welcome "we signified," says Calamy, "our particular design in giving him that "trouble; he appeared to take it well, and gave us all "imaginable encouragement to be frank and open with "him. He told us he could not see how such a practice "as that of coming to the Sacrament according to the "Church of England, merely to qualify for a place, could "possibly be justified; but should be very willing to hear "anything that could be offered." To this the two ministers responded, that from 1662 onwards (*i.e.* from a date previous by eleven years to the first Test Act) the practice of occasional communion with the established Church had been sanctioned by Baxter and Bates, and in general, by the moderate Presbyterians. The Bill under consideration, they added, "would not only give great "disturbance to a number of Her Majesty's most loyal "subjects" (at a time too, when sound policy, in face of a "hazardous and expensive war," dictated tranquillity at home) but would also "bid fair for destroying that little "charity yet remaining among us...." To these and similar arguments, Burnet (says Calamy) listened "with great at-"tention...and by his speech...in the Conference, we had the "satisfaction to see that our labour was not wholly lost." The incident convinced Calamy that, "upon critical exi-"gencies," such interviews with great men might "answer "very good ends."

The Conference failed; and with this dropped the Bill.

The action of the Prince meanwhile had exasperated the Whigs; and they sought an opportunity for revenge. The Bill settling his income (in case he should survive the Queen) contained some objectionable clauses; and, on this pretence, the Whig majority in the Upper House substituted a less acceptable measure. This second Bill, for which Burnet voted, reached the Commons January 14; and that same day "the Queen ordered the Bishop of "Salisbury's lodgings at St James's to be given to the "Bishop of London." Burnet however remained undismayed by these marks of Royal displeasure; and joined with those who "protested" in the Upper House against the passage of the Government Bill.

Shortly after, a very curious sequence of events brought the Burnet-Calamy conferences to the notice of the Tories. Calamy had apparently made no secret of the episode; while Calamy's friend at Sarum had written an account of the original interview to a minister in the Isle of Wight. The letter, being imperfectly addressed, was delivered to a clergyman of the established Church, who bore the same patronymic; and through him, some time during the following summer, it came into the hands of Atterbury, by whom it seems to have been published. Our readers can imagine Dr Atterbury's comments on the letter; which incidentally described Burnet as anxious for the conclusion of the dissenting schism at Salisbury, by the withdrawal of the two contending preachers; and as promising friendly intercourse with their successor, if a prudent and moderate man.

Burnet was compelled to defend himself, in a curious letter of which the destination does not appear.

"I did not" (he says) "mark by a watch how long "Mr C. stayed with me but...my steward says it was not "above half an hour, or an hour at most.

"I made, upon Mr C.'s going away without my inviting "him to dine, an excuse which several persons do yet "remember...that by reason of the heat of the time I had "not thought fit to invite him....These things are of no "consequence, I confess.

"I believe Mr C. confounds the conversation he had "with me at St James's, with that which passed at

"Salisbury; for the report of the Prince's being against "the Bill did not break out till about the time that the "Bill was brought in; nor had we any distinct knowledge "of the design of the Bill, while I stayed at Salisbury; and "for the Prince's dislike it was only a report...and it "appeared to be false afterwards.

"I have often owned that I had been much the better "for reading Mr Baxter's books while I was young; but it "never went to veneration, or to the owning him my "spiritual Father.

"Except in what relates to Dr Bates I could not say "Mr C. had done justice to all those [Presbyterians?] I "knew. I knew indeed but very few, but of those few "I cannot say but that more than justice is done them."

He refers, much as Calamy had done, to the argument concerning separation. "I might," he continues, "assent "to the expedient he told me was thought on, of removing "both the dissenting preachers from Salisbury; but am "pretty confident I did not move it. Nor did I encourage "the new preacher's coming to me, much less had I any "thought of managing elections by him; for I never "employed any of my own clergy in that. I never went "farther in that matter than the declaring my own opinion "and knowledge of two persons without ever speaking to "any person except my own tenants for his vote. So "either this is quite mistaken, or if the motion was made "to me, I do not believe I made any answer to it, or gave "it any entertainment; and the person's making no attempt "in order to his coming to me seems to confirm this."

"Not" (he adds) "that I decline seeing or conversing "with persons of different persuasions; but, considering "the heats and jealousies that are among us, I thought "I might with a better grace maintain my principles of "moderation while it appeared that I did not act upon any "understanding with those who divide from us, or in-"clination to their opinions or practices, or out of craft or "design; but that I went upon the general principle of "moderation, as the wisest, as well as the most Christian "method."

The concurrent session of Convocation was compact of the usual constitutional squabbles. Whatever the merits

of the case, writers of all shades concur in reprobating the captious tactics of the Lower House; and in praising the forbearance of the Bishops. They resisted a threatened appeal to the Privy Council as injurious to the Episcopal constitution; "adding, that it would be a strange sight, "and acceptable to their enemies (especially to the Papists) "to see the Convocation pleading their rights before a "Committee of Privy Council." The Lower House (stigmatizing this as a slur on its Episcopal zeal) challenged the Upper House to a concurrent pronouncement on the "Divine Right" of Episcopacy. The Bishops, as Lathbury says, retorted with tactical skill. Tenison adduced the Ordination Preface as the official explanation of the Church; and opined that any additional declaration would be really an unlicensed canon. He commended the Episcopal enthusiasm shown by the Lower House; and trusted that House "would continue to act in ac- "cordance."

The habitual use of the distinctions "High" and "Low "Church" and the final identification of the "High Church" and Tory parties, were the legacies of this stormy session.

Meanwhile the Anglican reaction rejoiced in a posthumous ally. During the year 1702 had appeared vol. 1 of the *History of the Rebellion*, by the Queen's grandfather, Lord Clarendon. But though the work gave impetus to the "Tory" current, it was read by Burnet with no less admiration than avidity. Clarendon he had always respected as an honest man, a "true Englishman, and a "sincere Protestant." The strictly constitutional Royalism of the great Chancellor resembled the tenets of that father, in whose steps Burnet so fondly believed himself to tread; and was as far removed from the violent Toryism of his sons, as from the more virulent "Cavalier" sentiment of his own time. Nor can we wonder if the stately eloquence of the "noble historian" inspired Burnet with the desire of improving his own "Secret History." He resolved in fact to recast his original memoirs.

The plan of the new work he modelled on that of De Thou; whose *Historia sui Temporis* (with its autobiographical appendix) he reverenced as much for its impartiality as for its high literary merit.

A curious incident precipitated, or at least shaped, this resolution. Some years earlier the dishonesty of a Whig friend and the treachery of a Jacobite transcriber, had thrown into the hands of Charles Leslie (Burnet's former Jacobite opponent) certain extracts from Burnet's Memoirs. Dating from nearly twenty years before, they included bitter reflections on the Anglican clergy of that date; and Leslie, in revenge of Burnet's action during the Occasional Conformity debates, published them with vitriolic comments in the spring of 1703. Burnet was naturally indignant, especially at the perfidy involved; but he took the hint, and now softened the most offensive of his diatribes.

His change of plan probably enhanced the vogue and influence of his narrative. A work under the graver style of *History* imposes more than very artless memoirs. To Burnet's own reputation, however, the transformation was not advantageous. In the first rank if we regard him as a writer of memoirs, Burnet claims no supreme place among historians of their own time. He had rarely stood within the innermost ring of politics; the documents which supplement the *lacunae* of experience were very seldom before him; inaccuracies, venial in one who frankly relies upon memory, loom large in a studied narrative. Nor had Burnet the leisure or the grasp which so vast an undertaking requires. Enormous as was the mass of his mental material, it was of necessity fragmentary and disjointed. His own career, his own observation form the thread of the original memoirs; and lend to an otherwise unconnected narrative a certain continuity of its own. In the *History* the various episodes, severed from their original context—that is from the order in which they came to Burnet's own knowledge—are arranged with little art or insight in a series professedly chronological. The narrative becomes abrupt, the interconnection of events obscure, the portraits mere strings of characteristics, unrelated, unexplained.

Moreover the subsequent revision of matter contemporaneously recorded had its own dangers for a man of Burnet's temper. Between the dates of composition and revision his own views had altered; and the revised version too often reflects the alteration. For his earlier frame of mind

had been on the whole the more calm and the more candid; and his original judgments are therefore in general the more historically sound and suggestive. Again, a picture which tries to combine two opposite points of view, will display a distorted perspective; and hard is the historian's task, who, where the memoirs fail us, attempts to resolve Burnet's published work into its original and imported constituents.

In style, too, the work suffered by revision. For Burnet, as we know, wrote best when he wrote in haste. The language of the original memoirs, homely and unpolished though it be, is racy, vigorous, and to the point; while under the pumice stone of reiterated revision it has become monotonously dull. Lecky once described the published *History* as "brilliant." From the literary point of view the epithet is singularly unhappy.

But much as we prefer the form of the original narrative; frankly as we admit that the revision not infrequently betrays the momentary animus of a hasty impressionable nature; we yet demur to the stern strictures it has brought on his moral honesty. Thirteen agitated years of fluctuating political relations must necessarily modify estimates of men, measures and events; new loyalties spring from fresh political ties. A portrait of Mr Chamberlain, penned by Lord Salisbury in 1881; a character of Mr Parnell, drawn by Mr Gladstone in 1889; an appreciation of Mr Gladstone himself, framed, ere the first Home Rule Bill, by one of those ardent adherents, who were to become his most embittered foes—any or all of these would have surely demanded revision, ere left for posthumous publication. And if Burnet in 1704 thought better of Churchill and worse of Nottingham than he had done in 1691, we can hardly be surprised that the fact is obvious in the narrative he finally sanctioned.

The revision of this work was to occupy Burnet, at intervals, during the remainder of his life. He continued meanwhile his current narrative, casting it, of course, from the first, into the mould of a formal *History*; for he wished to cover the half-century succeeding Charles II's Restoration.

Meanwhile, the consequence of the winter session

1702–3 had emphasized the breach between the Moderate-Tory War-Ministry, and its reactionary allies, and had rendered it more and more dependent on the loyalty of Whig support. As the summer advanced, the war became the touch-stone of party; Marlborough became increasingly restive under a policy of delay, increasingly jealous of the more extreme among the men in power. He could not prevent the Queen from creating a bevy of Tory Peers; but Rochester, who had personally affronted him, was summarily disgraced. We find the General wishing that Nottingham might be shelved; and hinting not obscurely that the death of Seymour would be a blessing. The Tories, he exclaims, if uncontrolled, would ruin England and Holland. Yet he is none the less convinced that the Whigs, if in power, would prove equally dangerous; and he thus came directly into contact with the growing Whig ardour of his imperious spouse. On one point, however, Marlborough, his lady, and their ally Godolphin found themselves thoroughly agreed; the impolicy of reviving the Bill so dear to the Tory zealots.

Accordingly the Queen, in her speech preliminary to the session of 1703–4, was induced to admit an intelligible eulogy of "union and agreement"; as a necessary preliminary to the successful prosecution of a war, which now aimed at the transference to the Hapsburgs of the entire Spanish Monarchy. Disregarding the hint, however, the extremists revived the obnoxious "Conformity Bill." Marlborough and Godolphin, thus openly defied, took refuge in a lukewarm acquiescence; while the meek Prince George was graciously permitted to abstain.

A majority of the Bishops now pronounced against the Bill, and Burnet headed the opposition in the House of Lords. His speech, which was printed "by desire," draws largely on Calamy's suggestions of the year before. It opens with an historical retrospect, and insists on the dangers of internal division in the face of foreign foes. Burnet sneers at the Non-juror support accorded to the Bill; and makes a pointed attack on Leslie ("the furiousest "Jacobite in England"), who advocates an approximation between the English and Gallican Churches. Occasional Communion Burnet defends by precedents derived from

Burnet's own habit abroad—from the practice of Royalist refugees in France, as recorded by the "noble historian "whom you are now all reading with much pleasure,"—and from the custom of nonconformists within his own diocese who had no by-ends to serve. He adheres to the *principle* of the Test Act, the Exclusion, that is, of men from public office, to whom Communion with the established Church seems an impossibility; but he demurs entirely to the penalties imposed by the Bill.

The House of Lords endorsed his objections by promptly rejecting the Bill on a second reading.

Leslie hastened to retort upon Burnet's strictures. In his oddly named *Cassandra* he resumed his charges against the MS. of the *Secret History*; and concluded a virulent onslaught with a bitter pen portrait, which, after Leslie's exclamatory fashion, paints the Bishop as a fanatic in disguise. The "Spirit of Enthusiasm" possesses him; that spirit which "puts out the eye of reason, and destroys "the sobriety of religion; leaves a man no principle or rule "but that of imagination and impulses; can make him believe "that he is in the exaltation of charity, while he is in the "very gall of bitterness, and delighting himself in the sin "of Ham. He is not afraid...to...bespatter both Church "and State...And can persuade himself that all this is out "of...zeal to the glory of God! This can sanctify schism "and rebellion in his eyes!...He imitates nothing of the "apostles, but their miracles! Turns religion into romance, "and will do nothing ordinary! He keeps himself in a "sphere above other mortals, whence he looks down upon "them with disdain, which he calls pity! His own in-"firmities, if he sees any in himself, he calls human "frailties, but all others offend of malicious wickedness! "He is of all men the most impatient of contradiction, "or any reflection upon his reputation, and yet he seeketh "not the honour of men! and thinks himself an holy and "humble man of heart!" This cruel caricature, it must be admitted, holds in solution that modicum of truth which makes a satire sting.

The next Parliamentary business on hand, however, combined, for once, the suffrages of the Queen, the Tories, and the Bishop. On her thirty-ninth birthday, February 6,

1704, Queen Anne made to Parliament a far-reaching announcement, for which she publicly admitted Burnet's ultimate responsibility. In accordance with the scheme urged by him for at least eight years she devoted to the augmentation of poor livings an annual income, valued by Burnet at £16,000, and now estimated at some ten times that amount. The effects of this munificent donation are well illustrated by the parish wherein these lines are written, and of which the modest revenues have been twice successively augmented through the Bounty of Good Queen Anne.

The session of Convocation proved rather less disorderly than usual, and the Lower House actually suggested some reforms, which the Bishops promptly endorsed. As several of these had long since received his sanction, it seems hardly just in Burnet to dismiss them with the curt comment, that the abuses most rampant among the lower clergy—non-residence, pluralities, etc. —were not included. Perhaps the House had excited Burnet's ire by its invidious comments on the existence of dissenting academies, and the validity of dissenting baptisms.

The year 1704 proved a time of the keenest tension. For Louis XIV had now resolved by one bold stroke to finish a war, which so far had been all in his favour. He therefore hurled his main force into Bavaria, so that the half-starved armies of the Empire might be crushed between the Franco-Bavarians in front, and the revolted Hungarians in the rear. Marlborough, by a yet bolder counter move[1], frustrated the French scheme, which threatened the Empire with annihilation. Cutting his communications behind him, he too plunged into Bavaria, and coalescing with the Imperialists, won on August 13, 1704 the decisive victory of Blenheim. Though the enemy's loss was estimated at 40,000 men, the moral effect was yet greater. It was the first unequivocal check received by Louis XIV.

The news reached England in an historic despatch (preserved in the Blenheim archives) addressed to the Duchess, and scribbled from the field of battle upon the back of a

[1] Suggested, so Klopp maintains, by the Imperial representative in London, Wratislaw.

tavern reckoning. She at once communicated the great news to her friend and correspondent Mrs Burnet, who was then at Salisbury.

The missive found a house in mourning. For on July 5 had been baptised in the Cathedral, under the significant names of Anna Sophia, an infant "daughter "of the Right Reverend Father in God, Gilbert, Lord "Bishop of Sarum, and Elizabeth his wife"; and on July 31, the babe had there been buried. Yet none the less Mrs Burnet's response is ecstatic. "The Bishop," she adds, "heartily prays for the continuance of the Duke's success, so "that the Queen [and her ministers] may have the greatest "glory that is possible...the restoring peace and liberty to "Europe, and what is greater, the free profession of the "Protestant religion [in France]...Sure no honest man can "refuse to unite in such noble designs. I am really giddy "with joy, and if I rave, you must forgive me. I can lament "for no private loss, since God has given such a general "mercy....The Bishop said he could not sleep, his heart was "so charged with joy. He desires your Grace would care-"fully lay up that little letter as a relic that cannot be valued "enough. Some wiser people than myself think the nation "is in so good a humour with this great success, and the "plentiful harvest, that better circumstances can hardly "meet for a new parliament." In plain English, Blenheim was a supreme triumph, not only for the European coalition, but for the English War party, *i.e.* for the Tory Moderates backed by their Whig allies.

By the extreme Tories, on the other hand (to quote Lord Stanhope's illustration), it was received as Waterloo was to be received by the extreme Whigs of 1815. "I "know," says Mrs Burnet, "that the people you mention... "will hardly ever believe any news that lessens France.... "This is true...of some who are not of the worst sort of "Tories, but give credit to what others set about." Little did the ardent and innocent lady guess that the General she extolled himself still corresponded with St Germain.

Such being the enthusiasm of the Whigs, the domineering Duchess urged her husband to identify himself with that party. But Marlborough and Godolphin, who had just shelved the unmanageable Nottingham in favour

of the more moderate and more accommodating Harley, shrank from another yoke. Marlborough indeed bitterly confined his aspirations to the attainment of reputation in lands "that have hardly any blessing but that of not "knowing the detested names of Whig and Tory."

But while the Ministry triumphed abroad, at home the state of Scotland gave cause for acute anxiety.

On Anne's accession the reign of Carstares had ended, and a veritable chaos had succeeded. For a change which in England had at first mollified all parties, had in Scotland intensified passion. The succession of a strong Episcopalian to the throne of a Presbyterian King, excited almost to madness the alarms of the Presbyterians. Fear of the Legislative Union (concerted during the preceding reign in the interest of the Hanoverian settlement) gave a frenzied energy to the counsels of a new Nationalist party. Meanwhile the unsettled state of the Scottish succession[1] and the ineradicable belief (common to all parties beyond the Border) that Anne secretly favoured her brother's eventual restoration, kept alive, in the highest degree, dynastic hopes and fears.

At least six groups could be traced in the distracted realm. The avowed Jacobites shaded off into the "Cavalier" interest (led by Queensberry, Secretary of State), which corresponded to the more moderate English Tories and was bitterly hated by the Jacobite extremists. It desired the toleration of episcopacy, and was credited with an at least pious wish for its restoration. It was confronted by Argyll and the extreme Presbyterians, who resisted every form of episcopalian indulgence, as the thin end of a wedge. Meanwhile Burnet's old pupil, Fletcher of Saltoun, devoted his fiery talents to the cause of the Nationalist party, which was reinforced by the "Darien" malcontents, under Hamilton and Tweeddale. The most temperate, and probably the most statesmanlike of the groups, consisted of the "Hanoverians," Moderate Presbyterians, or "Whigs"; these answered on the whole to the less extreme of their English namesakes, and were headed by Burnet's cousins, "Mr Secretary" Johnston and Mr

[1] The Act of Settlement only applied to England and Ireland.

Baillie (of Jerviswood). With these it is clear Burnet himself sympathized.

A new Parliament had met at Edinburgh in May 1703, when the position of the Commissioner, Queensberry, had proved pitiable in the extreme. The Presbyterians had compelled his assent to a stringent act, which numbered attacks on the Presbyterian settlement among acts of high treason. The Nationalists had wrung from him his sanction to a further measure, which would have wrested from succeeding Kings of Scotland the power of peace and war. But even Queensberry had stoutly refused to endorse their drastic Bill of Security. This contemplated total separation, on a demise of the Crown, unless the "just "rights of Scotland" should have been previously safeguarded. The provisions proposed to that end would, in the eyes of Burnet and other impartial observers, have turned Scotland into an oligarchical republic, the form favoured by Fletcher. In the interval the Bill proposed ominous methods for the security of the Scottish border.

Rather than pass this bill, Queensberry had summarily prorogued. The evil day, however, was thus only deferred; and the ramifications of a supposed Jacobite plot in Scotland had largely occupied the English Parliament during the session of 1703–4. Burnet claims to have revised many of the State Papers emanating from the House of Lords, of which Somers was the original author.

As a result it became necessary to supersede Queensberry, who, much as he was hated by the Jacobites, stood suspected of Jacobite leanings; Tweeddale took his place as Commissioner for the session of 1704. Johnston, however, who appeared as Lord Clerk Register, in the post so long held by his father, was really the man of the hour.

He had points of contact with all the groups, save the Jacobites, and the followers of Fletcher. A Scotchman and patriot, he had tried to avenge Glencoe, and had been made a scapegoat for Darien; and yet he was unquestionably loyal to the Hanoverian Succession. A steady supporter of the Presbyterian settlement, he could urge a claim on the gratitude of the moderate Episcopalians.

Johnston's policy contemplated the conciliation of the

less extreme Nationalists, by the offer of a very limited monarchical constitution, of which the principle had been conceded by Charles I in 1641. In return he thought the Scottish Parliament might be reasonably expected to concur in the Hanoverian settlement. This policy, which resembled the tactics by which the Succession Act had been carried through an English House of Commons, proved however a complete failure. Nationalists and Jacobites combined to question the *bona fides* of the Government, a suspicion for which Burnet could see no foundation; and despite a perfunctory vote in favour of the Union, the Bill of Security was "tacked" to the Bill of Supply. As this involved with the fate of the Bill the pay of the forces in Scotland, which was already much in arrears, Godolphin counselled surrender. A few days before the battle of Blenheim, the Act of Security received the Royal Assent.

In England this step aroused the most impassioned alarm and resentment; and when late in October, 1704, Parliament again met, Godolphin found himself violently attacked. The extreme or "peace" Tories saw their opportunity, and threatened a vote of censure; on the plea that Godolphin, by giving this assent, had acted against the interests of the House of Hanover. They were reinforced, on principle, by the Whigs; and Dartmouth, who was in the House of Lords, describes with vivacity how in the midst of a violent Philippic from a Whig leader the alarmed Godolphin sold himself to the Whigs. They consequently brought him off; and in this transaction, Burnet, who was strong for the Union, showed himself an active agent. He pointed out that though Godolphin, under financial pressure, had sanctioned the obnoxious Bill, Queensberry, a year earlier, and without that excuse, had endorsed the yet more dangerous measure which was to take from future sovereigns the power of peace and war. He did his best to minimize the offensive aspects of the Security Bill, and of the spirit which had evoked it from its countrymen. He dilated on the bad government under which, since the dynastic union, Scotland had groaned; and touched on the ever increasing exasperation "which [had] made Charles the First grant

"not only the concessions [of] 1641, but those of a higher "nature; of which" the Bishop "had now read an account "...in Clarendon's third volume." Upon the Restoration (he added) "...for a remedy, a council was established "of Scotch and English, and all orders were to be given "above board; but a great man [Lauderdale]...who "would have all the power to himself, broke this." Thereupon had followed great disorders, including the miserable episode of the Highland Host. "At the Revolution...a "Union was designed," but the scheme miscarrying "a "great many errors had been committed, which he desired "not to mention. But he could not abstain from putting their "Lordships in mind of what they had done in the matter "of Darien. That was just enough to irritate the Scotch, "and to make them believe that it was a mighty valuable "project; which drove them into the unhappy subscription "that cost them so dear."

Fortunately for the interests in which Burnet was so much concerned, the sagacity of Somers now took the lead. England's retort to the objectionable measure was an Act, empowering negotiations for a treaty of Union. Behind these pacificatory proposals however, there lurked an adroit menace. Unless the Union should be consummated within a definite period, the Scots were to become aliens, their produce being excluded from the English markets; and it was further proposed, that the English borders should be set in a state of defence. Against even this conditional retaliation, Burnet seems to have protested; for he feared to irritate a sensitive national pride. The Ministerialists in the Lower House, meanwhile, had some difficulty in carrying through the Bill.

Nor were purely English affairs denied their share of asperity. Fired by the Scotch example and urged by Nottingham, the extreme Tories in the Commons would have "tacked" to a Bill of Supply the Occasional Conformity Bill, introduced for the third time. As this would have jeopardized the funds for the ensuing campaign, and the consequent fate of the European coalition, the Ministerialists rallied round their leaders, Harley and St John. The "tackers" were defeated by a large majority; and the Bill, sent up after the usual fashion for the third

time, was rejected by the House of Lords. This time Marlborough and Godolphin voted with the majority.

In Convocation, meanwhile, the Lower House fell foul of a Visitation Charge, in which Burnet had reflected on its proceedings; but the Bishops came to his defence.

In accordance with the existing "Triennial Act" a General Election now impended; and to quote Burnet's own words "the conclusion of the Parliament set the whole "nation in a general ferment. Both sides studied how to "dispose people's minds in the new elections, with great "industry and zeal....The affairs of France were run very "low....They could not create that confidence which is "justly put in Parliamentary credit....So it was visible that "a good election in England must give such a prospect "for three years, as would have a great influence on all the "affairs of Europe." Burnet, on his part, with a view to the crisis, seems to have published anonymously one at least of the abortive pamphlets which he had draughted before the peace of Ryswick.

Moreover, as he tells us, the clergy (irritated at the loss of the Occasional Conformity Bill) "took great pains to "infuse into all people tragical apprehensions of the danger "the Church was in....Books were writ and dispersed over "the nation with great industry to possess all people with "the apprehensions that the Church was to be given up, "that the Bishops were betraying it, and that the court "would sell it to the dissenters."

To one of these pamphlets—an acrimonious *Memorial* to the clergy—Burnet seems to have draughted a reply. For there exists among his papers, in MS., an *Advice to the Clergy of the Church of England, by one of their body*, which, though not in Burnet's handwriting, betrays obvious traces of his style. In this curious and interesting document the worth and piety of the Queen are specially extolled. Burnet accentuates her care in respect of church preferment; lately shown in the appointment of Dr Bull and Dr Beveridge to the sees vacated by simony. This, together with her recent "Bounty" constitute a special claim on the fidelity of the clergy. The aspersions upon her loyalty to the English establishment (founded on the *Regium Donum* to Irish

Presbyterianism, and her acknowledgment of a Presbyterian Church in Scotland) are indignantly repudiated. The general support of the Protestant interest in Ireland is imperatively necessary; and a sum much greater than the *Regium Donum* is assigned from the Royal Purse for the "poor Episcopal clergy in Scotland." As regards the Presbyterian settlement beyond the border, even "King "Charles the Martyr, when the necessity of his affairs" required it, acquiesced in a similar scheme. That Church has a Parliamentary sanction; and the Queen's loyal maintenance of a legal constitution, whereof she personally disapproves, is a pledge of even greater fidelity to a legal constitution "in which she herself hopes to be saved."

The Bishops of the English establishment are liberally eulogized; and in especial Burnet rebuts the charge of familiarity with the profane. He no doubt alludes to the notorious Lord Wharton, the widower of the poetical Mrs Anne, an unscrupulous Whig, and a singularly shameless debauchee. Slander, suggests the Bishop, frequently exaggerates; each party has its own black sheep. If a "concurrence of opinion" makes the Bishops "agree "with persons whose errors they...correct all they can" their "particular friendships" are reserved (he says) for the virtuous.—Was not Laud more justly aspersed by the Puritans for his courtship of Buckingham?

A discreet eulogy of Tenison concludes with a neat equivocation; "I have not been...preferred by him; and I "am sure I never shall be." In the character of "another "prelate" we recognize—*Burnet himself.* "He never "fled from his own country; if he had he must have gone "somewhere else than...into this. He served this church "many years without receiving one farthing of its revenue; "yet was all that while in spite of ill-usage still serving it "in eminent instances, and had the honour to contribute "not a little to save us in our greatest extremities; and "this with his inflexible firmness to the revolution, and his "persisting in his principles of moderation, are the main "articles upon which the hatred and clamour raised against "him are grounded; though his labours and services might "entitle him to better usage." This anonymous self-laudation is really delightful.

Burnet takes further occasion to denounce ecclesiastical party spirit. "What," he asks, "is the meaning of this "distinction of *High* and *Low Church*; do not both agree "in doctrine, worship and government?" *Moderation*—(a quality vituperated by extremist pamphleteers, as equivalent to Laodicean tepidity)—he eulogizes in language reminiscent of his old friend "The Trimmer."—"What "means," he exclaims, "all the anger that some vent at "*moderation*? It is a word of a good sound in the world; "it signifies *a due measure*, and is as opposite to a feeble "remissness as to excessive rigour." It appears in the English Bible (though, as Burnet admits in a quaint parenthesis, the rendering may be questioned); and the Queen herself has publicly endorsed it in a speech before Parliament. Self-control under great provocation is required, he admits, of a Moderate. At the close of Charles II's reign (he reminds his readers) moderation, as now, seemed a crime to many eyes; but the wheel soon turned; and the extremists, in terror, left the brunt of the anti-Roman campaign to the men they had despised. "Implicit obedience...to everything that some are pleased "to call the Church"—(a style too often arrogated by the "humours and passions of a few noisy men")—he specially deprecates. "Holy emulation" in well-doing is the best weapon against dissent; and the tract ends with a pathetic ascription to Him who stills the waves, and brings to the desired haven.

Unluckily Burnet's impetuosity too often over-rode his principles. "Peace," says his own admirable maxim, "may "be pursued with an unpeaceable spirit." His conduct during the election illustrates the position.

Though the Queen's speech and subsequent official changes had seemed to favour the Whigs, the election policy of the Moderate-Tory War-Ministry—of Marlborough, Godolphin, Harley and St John—had been one of "masterly inactivity." Their real hope had been, that none of the extreme factions should obtain a working majority; since an equal distribution of parties must give the Government the lead. Of this lethargy Burnet complains. The extreme Tories, he says, were very active; while the "Court acted with...caution and coldness" like an

"indifferent spectator." But there was an exception to this rule. Against the insolent and troublesome "muti-"neers" who had "tacked" the Conformity Bill, both Queen and Ministry harboured an abiding resentment.

The Queen—privately encouraged, it may be, by ministerial hints—did a little electioneering to their despite. Among these extremists ranked Mr Charles Fox, paymaster of the forces in Ireland, an uncle by the half-blood of the famous Charles James, and at this time member for Salisbury. Rumour affianced him to the Queen's cousin, a daughter of Lord Rochester. None the less, the Queen, says Burnet, "spoke to me with relation to the elections. She said we "saw she trusted to us; and in particular she spoke "severely of Mr Fox." Hereupon Burnet, who, so far, had valued himself on abstaining from election controversies, "set" his "whole strength to keep [Fox] out. For I "(he says) being lord of the whole town, and having laid "many obligations on the body in general, and on most "of the electors, I thought I might for once recommend "[Mr Harris] to them." Burnet's method of canvassing is not likely to have been discreet; and in fine, to use his own words, "I failed in my attempt, and it raised a most "violent storm against me from the Tories, who by many "very bad practices are now a majority in the Corpora-"tion."

Nor did the resentment he had excited end with the borough election. The county contest seems to have been yet more embittered. Defoe, Harley's confidential agent, had reported from the Dorsetshire part of the diocese that the relations between all parties were there good, and the extreme Tories at a discount; but he adds that at the Wiltshire election the most violent scenes ensued. On the day of the poll Salisbury was a pandemonium. The Bishop and his steward were hustled by the clergy and the mob; his friends were maltreated; the Dukes of Somerset and Bolton received "strange insults" in the streets.

A by-election at Chippenham, which occurred a few months later evoked yet more discreditable tactics. One Colonel Chivers ("the profoundest rake and bully" in the county of which he was the "scandal") owed his position as High Tory candidate entirely to certain vile aspersions

upon the Bishop; whom he professed to have seen "in an "infamous place and in scandalous deportment." These had brought upon him from Burnet a threat of proceedings on the charge of *Scandalum Magnatum*; against which it was hoped to shield him by a member of Parliament's privilege. The attempt, one is glad to hear, miscarried; Chivers failed to secure the seat, and lost with it the chance of securing himself by privilege of Parliament. Burnet, however, with his usual generosity consented to withdraw his charge, on receiving a public retractation, and a sum of £50 for his poor. The Jacobites of course insinuated that Chivers had recoiled, because he was conscious that a jury would have been packed.

The zeal of Burnet during this Parliamentary contest was a target for the sneers of Swift; and subsequently occasioned great regret to himself. "I am sensible," he wrote in his autobiography five years later, "it was an "error in me, occasioned by my too forward zeal to serve "and please the Queen. Things of that sort draw very "bad consequences after them." Up to this date there is no reason to believe that the Bishop's relation with the townsmen of New Sarum had been other than friendly; but this unhappy accident "has raised," says Burnet, "an "anger against me which will follow me as long as I live "here."

The ill-feeling thus induced affected indeed even his relations with the Cathedral body. On August 9 the Deanery of Sarum became vacant by the death of Dean Young, who had held it but three years; and the breath, accurately speaking, was hardly out of his body ere the Bishop, in an express to Godolphin, was broaching the question of his successor. For Dr Younger, canon residentiary of St Paul's (apparently an absentee incumbent in the diocese of Sarum), flaunted "the Queen's promise and "your Lordship's for the next Deanery. An absolute "promise," as Burnet admits, "must be ever sacred"; but if the pre-engagement be only conditional Burnet deprecates the appointment. Younger indeed is "a quiet good-"natured man; but I know," says Burnet, "what his bias "[is] and what power his wife and others have over him. "He was Mr Fox's tutor, and his engagements lie all that

"way....There is a greater heat than your Lordship can "well imagine...since our last election. Perhaps stories "have been carried to Court as if I had made use of the "Queen's name; which I affirm to you is false. All I said "that looked that way was (in excuse for my recommending "now when I had not done it these 16 years past) that "the Queen looked on a good choice of this Parliament as "that upon which the quiet of her life and reign and the "happiness of her people depended; since probably a peace "would be made within its period. It is said that both "before the election and since Dr Y[ounger] has served Mr "Fox's interest, and has assured his party that the Queen "is well pleased with their election." Burnet suggests alternative candidates, all apparently eminent; including the great Bentley—hardly, one would think, an amiable subordinate. All these would vacate preferment, which would remain available for Dr Younger. If however Younger must be the man, Burnet begs he may be cautioned. "For those here who are most against the "Queen's measures, against the Duke and Duchess of "Marlborough and your Lordship, are already triumphing "in the hope of his advancement."

Younger, however, received the appointment; and the two dignitaries, as we might expect, soon engaged in animated warfare. A vacant canonry afforded the bone of contention. The merits of the case are obscure; in point of temper, Burnet certainly failed.

Meanwhile, despite Ministerial supineness, the energy of the Whigs who "exerted themselves with great activity "and zeal," and were everywhere supported by the dissenters, secured them, at the polls, an overwhelming preponderance. Hereupon, as Burnet innocently remarks, "the Lord Godolphin *declared himself more openly "than he had done formerly in their favour*." In plain English, the Moderate-Tory War-Ministry was at the mercy of its Whig supporters; and was forced to secure their fidelity by a partial admittance to office. In October, the Whig Cowper received the Great Seal; and when Parliament met, and the Commons were to choose a Speaker, the Ministry supported the Whig candidate in preference to a Tory extremist.

In revenge the extremists moved that the Electress Sophia should be at once invited to England. As the Electress was believed to desire this, while the Queen strongly resented the suggestion, the Ministry seemed on the horns of a dilemma; condemned to offend either the Queen *in esse* or *in posse*. These unprincipled tactics, however, overshot the mark. The Queen's anger reacted on the proponents; and the Whigs, under the unexpectedly dexterous leadership of Bishop Burnet, solved the difficulty. For Burnet proposed, as an alternative, that the House of Hanover should be naturalized; and that provision should be at once made for the continuity of public business (on a demise of the Crown) during the interval which must elapse ere the successor could reach England. Godolphin supported him; and the Tory attempt to "dish the "Whigs" resulted in bitter mortification. An elaborate Regency Bill, drawn by Somers, and supported in terms of smooth sarcasm by their hated enemy Wharton, proved, in the event, one of the main engines of the Hanoverian party at the crisis of 1714.

The incident, however, left a legacy of mistrust between the Courts of St James's and Hanover,—between Hanover and the English Whigs.

The triumphant Whigs now turned on the Tory Rochester, and challenged him to substantiate his war-cry of the "Church in danger." During the course of an acrimonious discussion all the topics of ecclesiastical discontent combatted in Burnet's *Advice* were marshalled anew. Rochester however had the support of but two among the Bishops, Sharp Archbishop of York and Compton Bishop of London; whose characters suffer accordingly in the Memoirs and autobiography of Burnet. They evinced special uneasiness as to the spread of religious infidelity, and the intolerance of Scotch Presbyterianism; while Compton pointedly denounced a sermon of Hoadley's on Resistance. Burnet's retort is apt: 'If 'the doctrine of that sermon was not good, he did not know 'what defence his lordship could make for his appearing 'in arms at Nottingham' in 1688. The extreme Tories Burnet compared to the French 'Leaguers'; who by the cry of 'the Church in danger' would have forced their

King into a monastery for their own behoof. 'As to the 'Scots affairs, he was particularly acquainted with them, 'and therefore he would venture to speak with the more 'assurance: that the Scots Kirk being established without 'a toleration was an unfair allegation; for there needed no 'law for toleration, where there was no law to inhibit. The '[nonconforming] Episcopalians were not forbid to worship 'God their own way, being only excluded from livings; 'and that there were at that time fourteen Episcopal 'meeting-houses in Edinburgh, as open as the Churches, 'and as freely resorted to; in many of which the English 'liturgy was used; but that in several of them the Queen 'was not prayed for. And the bill for giving patrons 'liberty of conferring their benefices on clerks Episcopally 'ordained would have passed (at least King William had 'allowed it) if they would have put in a clause to oblige 'them to take the oath to the government.' He taunted Rochester with his own ministerial connivance in the very stringent Act by which Scotch Presbyterianism had been confirmed. 'As to what a noble prelate had advanced, he 'owned, that the Church would always be subject to the 'enmity of profaneness and irreligion; that the devil 'would have his agents in the world, be the government 'never so careful; but he hoped he might say, that 'irreligion and profaneness were not now at a higher pitch 'than usually.' Indeed, he hoped the contrary, on account of the work of the 'Religious' societies; to which he found little contributed 'by those who appeared so 'wonderfully zealous for the Church.' The license of the press he deplored; but illustrated it by the High Tory sermons of Tilly and Madder.

Eventually a division was demanded; and it appeared by 61 votes to 30 that the Church was in a flourishing condition: upon which all insinuating the reverse were denounced as foes to Queen, Church, and kingdom. The Commons by 212 votes to 160 endorsed a similar resolution; the rout of the Tory extremists was complete.

Moreover their covert attack on Marlborough's conduct of the campaign threw the great General yet further into the arms of the Whigs; and the formal coalition between

the Whig leaders on the one hand—Marlborough and Godolphin, Harley and St John on the other—was inaugurated on January 6 by the dinner at Harley's, which Cowper so graphically describes.

Burnet was perfectly satisfied with the results of the session; and anticipated, with much complacency, the remaining two years' existence of so exemplary a House of Commons.

In Convocation, meanwhile, the Lower House proved yet more obstreperous than usual; and the Queen had to intervene in support of the Archbishop's authority.

The Lower House of Convocation in particular, and the entire "High Church" position in general, were in consequence vigorously assaulted by Tindal (later known as a professed Deist) in his *Rights of the Christian Church asserted.* The work made a profound sensation. In language of trenchant lucidity, deliberately framed to insult clerical feeling, but freely garnished with appreciative references to Burnet, Tindal had developed a somewhat crude theoretic radicalism, and an Erastianism absolutely unqualified.

Burnet hereupon found himself in a significant dilemma. The Erastianism of Tindal, the Erastianism *i.e.* of the eighteenth century, was indeed entirely different from Burnet's own. For in Burnet's mind political Erastianism—the belief that the State can accord to no rival organization *politically coercive* powers—coexisted with a belief equally profound in the *spiritual* vocation of the ecclesiastical order. The divine authority of the Christian faith—the divine significance of the Christian sacraments—the divine mission, educative and pastoral, of the Christian Ministry—were to him no less real than the "Divine Right" of the State to supreme political control. That he condemned Tindal's work is absolutely certain. But in the purely political sphere he found it difficult to traverse arguments which were the logical outcome of his own. "I shall be sorry," he wrote to the Archbishop on June 15, 1706, "if any of our friends "answer it; for so much must be yielded if we will defend "the Reformation that it will raise a new controversy; for "hot people will think the Church is given up by what is "yielded." He thinks it unwise to employ Mr Kelsey,

whose "notions are generally wrong in that matter.... I hope," he continues, "your Grace will consider well what scheme "can justify the government of this Church before the "Wars by the High Commission, and now by the Court "of Delegates, which is the *Dernier Resort*. Both are "authorized by Act of Parliament, and a Commission "under the Great Seal, which is only civil and cannot be "called Ecclesiastical."

The political situation also occupies his thoughts. "God," he adds, "make us all thankful as we ought to "be for the glorious successes abroad, and the hopes of "the Union between the two kingdoms. When these are "brought to a good conclusion, many of our controversies "at home will fall with them."

The triumph of the Allies had indeed been overwhelming; and Burnet's description of the year 1706 as the "signal" year is very just. Ramillies made Marlborough the master of the Spanish Netherlands; Eugene, by the brilliant relief of Turin, recovered Northern Italy; and in Spain, thanks to the romantic exploits of Peterborough, there was a moment when the French claimant, amid the glooms of an appropriate eclipse, had been forced beyond the Pyrenees.

Pushed hard on every side, with exhausted national finances, Louis XIV at this juncture made repeated overtures for peace. It is difficult to say how far he was sincere; how far he was playing on the hopes and fears of our unamiable Dutch ally. His notorious bad faith, at all events, now reacted on himself; and many suspected that offers emanating from Versailles could aim but at the sundering of the Alliance. Ostensibly, however, his terms almost coincided with those of the Second Partition Treaty; Spain and the Indies for the Hapsburgs; the Italian territories for the Duc d'Anjou (the titular King of Spain); for the Dutch, commercial advantages and the "Barrier" they coveted; for England, commercial advantages and the abandonment of the "Pretender's" claim.

These offers were open to one grave objection. While calculated to satisfy the aims of the two sea-powers, they ruthlessly ignored the interests of Vienna; for the Milanese in French hands meant to Austria a standing menace. On the other hand, it was an object with the sea-powers that

the Spanish Indies should not fall to France, which might monopolise a lucrative trade. It was this conflict of interests which had caused England to pronounce for the recovery of the entire Spanish monarchy; and the dilemma, imperfectly grasped by most English historians, excuses in some part the neglect of the French advances. For if Austria desired for herself Italy, and if England and the United Provinces desired for Austria Spain and the Indies, no Partition Treaty could be devised which would satisfy all three confederates; while a Conference would give to France an excellent occasion for sowing dissensions among the Allies.

But if statesmanlike reasons could be pleaded against the terms, personal and party considerations had probably yet more weight. The Tory members of the Government —such as Harley and St John—were hampered by former Tory invective against the terms of the Partition Treaty. For Marlborough, the prospect of pulverizing France in another brilliant campaign, and pocketing meanwhile the enormous emoluments of his position, had irresistible attractions. And war was the interest of the Whig phalanx on which the Ministry relied; and which, while just beginning to taste the sweets of power, needed the impetus of the war-fever, to countervail the animus of ecclesiastical passion.

To Burnet, on the other hand, appealed a very different motive; horror at the renewed persecution which racked the Huguenot remnant—at the atrocities which had driven into revolt the wild mountaineers of the Cevennes. When, at the close of this *annus mirabilis*, a national Te Deum at St Paul's gave thanks for the triumphs of the year, Burnet was the chosen preacher; and delivered a passionate, almost fanatical Philippic against Louis, which even the uncourtly Johnston thought rather too strong.

In this Burnet uncompromisingly advocates war to the bitter end; war, till what has been usurped is abandoned, till the exiles are restored, till the prisoners are released, till the Edicts that were their inheritance are revived, till compensation has been made for "the precious blood...shed "among them"; till "the oppressor is so bounded that his "own people are secured from oppression and his neigh-

"bours from invasion." Till then, let men say as God has done, "There is no peace to the wicked." Ahab and Benhadad are recalled for England's example; she is sternly adjured to deny her enemy the respite he but demands that he may recruit his waning strength! A Hebrew prophet,—a hermit of the Crusades,—a zealot of the Covenant, might thus have urged his hearers against the Foes of God[1].

Nor did Burnet confine himself to pulpit utterances. We find him presenting petitions from the French refugees, who asked that their interests might be considered in the terms of a general peace; and pleading the same cause with the Queen and Council.

More statesmanlike was Burnet's attitude towards the other question of the hour; the Union with Scotland. Its history need not detain us. Johnston and his party, though superseded during the summer of 1705 (on the failure of his negotiation) by an odd coalition of Presbyterians and Cavaliers, had nevertheless kept together. They had definitely declared for Union, the truest guarantee of a Protestant Succession; and as the so-called "Squadrone "Volante" held the casting vote. Negotiations had been happily initiated; but many (among whom was Burnet) had despaired of eventual success. Under the able management of Somers, however, who was specially and keenly interested in the dynastic problem, three summer months of 1706 had sufficed to frame a practical scheme. The terms, according to Burnet (himself an Anglicized Scot) were eminently favourable to Scotland; and the Ministry tactfully submitted it, in the first instance, to the Parliament of the smaller kingdom. The furious opposition of the Nationalist, the Jacobite, and the extreme Presbyterian interests is matter of history. But the strange vacillations of Hamilton (the Lord Arran of Burnet's youth) weakened his own side; the Government, by an astute payment of all outstanding debts, gratified some important voters; while commercial ambition, the prospect of compensation for

[1] The printed version of this Sermon marks the close of a long connection, and the beginning of a new one. It is published not by Chiswell, who was growing old, but by the firm of Churchill, which had ties with Burnet's own diocese, and which seems henceforth to have enjoyed his patronage.

Darien, and the steady support of the "Flying Squadron" mastered all opposition. Burnet and his ardent wife watched the struggle with the keenest interest. Johnston more than once mentions their frequent intercourse with Godolphin; and describes Mrs Burnet as "high in favour "and confidence."

The Bill passed the Scots Parliament on January 15, 1707; and on receiving this news the Queen, at Westminster, solemnly announced the fact. By February 15 the House of Lords had resolved itself into Committee to consider the main issue; and with a graceful tact, which suggests the initiative of Somers, had voted to the Chair the prelate who was himself a Scot. On the 27th, despite some Tory opposition, Burnet was able to report in favour of the great measure.

Meanwhile the Lower House of Convocation was protesting against a step which must introduce into the legislature a Presbyterian element. The Queen, greatly annoyed, checked the House by a timely prorogation; and ere this was at an end, the Bill had received her assent.

On March 24, for the last time, the Parliament of England was prorogued; and six weeks later the Union became effectual. It was the culminating moment in the reign of Queen Anne.

From these exalted topics we return to more personal issues. The September of the preceding year had brought Burnet's sixty-third birthday; and he had therefore completed the twelvemonth which astrological tradition held to be the hyper-critical or "climacteric." The Tories, with malicious glee, told how an aged retainer, emulating his master's guests, congratulated the Bishop on attaining his "grand *hypo*-critical" year.

The fact, however, that he had married rather late in life, gave him children still of an age to exercise a parent's thoughts. Of their education he had, as his autobiography informs us, taken, upon touching motives, "a more than "ordinary care"; believing that "the pains" his father had expended in respect of his own training constituted a special obligation, to be paid to the next generation. Remembering, however, as he tells us, "the ill effect" the paternal severity had had on himself, his "bias lay the

"other way; to a remiss gentleness, of which I thank God "I have not yet seen any ill effects. I determined," he adds, "to keep them with me at home. I know emulation "and example, with lively company, awakens young spirits; "and a Bishop's table accustomed young persons to a great "variety, and to much liberty. But my sons were lively "enough and learned as quick[ly] as I desired."

This facility was evidently enhanced by their father's judicious management. His methods of intellectual training, as we have already observed, improved on the fashion of his (and we may add of our own) time. With but five hours study a day, and the minimum of grammatical drudgery, the boys, says Burnet, learnt four times as much as they would have acquired at school. Meanwhile they had ample leisure for their "childish diversions"; and their tutors, of whom each had one, opportunity for private study.

At the age of *thirteen*, after the manner of those days, the eldest had gone to Trinity College, Cambridge. He had a private tutor, and a "very good scholar for his "servant" to provoke his emulation. For such mere children discipline was of course imperative; but despite Burnet's half-deprecating confession of indulgence, the letter of introduction which the boy had carried to his tutor is stringent in the extreme. The Bishop's rules as to chapel, associates, pocket-money, and games, recall the stern atmosphere of Glasgow University. Not only must the lad be "exact" in the performance of religious observances; not only is he to become "an example to "the whole College" either by means of his "order and "obedience" or as an instance "of discipline and correc- "tion"; not only is he to refrain, without leave expressly given, from alehouses, treating-houses, taverns, and coffee-houses; but save by his tutor's allowance he is forbidden to contract "familiarities with any boys." He is indeed to be allowed "a crown every Saturday" (his "man" meanwhile receiving the weekly sum of sixpence); but he is to keep a strict account, "which you shall call for, that you may judge "of the way of laying it out; and that no part of it may go "for fruit, wine, or sweetmeats." Moreover, "if he loses "gloves or handkerchiefs let these be bought out of his

"own money; and for lesser faults, let a part of his "punishing be the forfeiting" of it in whole or partially. "Let his behaviour," moreover, "be watched in any sort "of game or play that is allowed the scholars; that all "eagerness in play, and chiefly the desire of winning of "money be resisted; [for] that is both a great waster of "time, and contributes much to debauch and corrupt the "mind." His studies are left to his tutor; who should, however, try to persuade him to study history in his leisure. "I would not," adds the Bishop, "provoke too much a "disputatious humour; but let him and his man chop logic "together as much as they please. Pray give not too "much heed to vanity, and to his humour of talking. His "morals hitherto have been kept pure. I never knew him "lie, nor did I ever hear that a bad word or an oath came "out of his mouth...." A kindly postscript to this detailed epistle commends *man* no less than *master* to the tutor's watchful care.

Such anxious solicitude, however, too frequently defeats its end; and we learn, without surprise, that young Burnet had soon rebelled. Horrified at the "idleness and dis-"obedience of that stubborn boy," Burnet, despite the tender step-mother's intervention, had removed the offender from College; sending him to eat the bread of tears under the care of Craig the mathematician. Bitter as was the father's disappointment, he refused, with generous candour, to blame either tutor or man; whose future he promised to assure by every means in his power.

The career of his younger sons at Merton seems to have been more satisfactory. By 1707 the second, Gilbert, (who had just, at the age of seventeen, taken his degree), was probably preparing for Orders; while Burnet contemplated for William and Thomas (aged respectively eighteen and thirteen, and both destined for the Bar) a year's residence at the University of Leyden.

An occasion soon presented itself for seeing them safely over. The health of Mrs Burnet, always frail, and probably impaired by the practice of secret austerities, showed symptoms of consumption; and the waters of "The "Spa" were recommended. Secondary arguments probably assisted her resolution. The fortune of Mrs Mary Burnet

(invested, under the care of trustees, in Dutch securities) was unsatisfactorily managed. The Spa, moreover, lies within reasonable reach of—*Hanover*.

The rumour of Mrs Burnet's intended journey, and some hint of its possible goal, occasioned no little excitement. She was known to be an ardent Whig; and the relations of the Whigs to the Hanoverian Court were just then in a transition stage. The Elector remained indifferent to his English prospects; while it was justly suspected that the old Electress' reluctance to supersede the elder branch was only controlled by motives of European expediency. None the less, the debates of 1705 had inspired some distrust of the party which had so effectually postponed the visit of the Electress. Moreover, Mrs Burnet could not be regarded as a merely private person. She stood in the closest relation towards a powerful individuality, the supreme patron of the Whigs. As a bosom friend of the Duchess of Marlborough, her visit threatened to assume almost international importance.

On this topic the Duke, then at the Hague, wrote to his wife, in cipher, with evident alarm. Mrs Burnet (he warns the Duchess) will be regarded as her representative. "I wish, with all my heart, she may not undertake this "journey; for it must do harm with [the Queen] and can "be of no use to anybody."

Mrs Burnet, however, with step-sons and a step-daughter, left England May 29; and her diary, still extant (though partly in cipher) is of great and curious interest. Business, politics, religion, the war, alarms from French outposts, and the daily incidents of travel, jostle one another in its pages. She mingled amicably with Jacobite exiles; including Cockburn, Anglican chaplain at Amsterdam, of persecuting whom Atterbury accused her husband; and who was to write, seventeen years later, some garrulous reminiscences of that husband's early days. At Brussels, a Roman Catholic Councillor had, she found, perused works by Burnet and by Locke; while 50,000 copies of his militant *Thanksgiving Sermon* had been published out of England.

She reached Hanover September 18; and Leibnitz (whose illness prevented more than a passing introduction) tells us the Electress expressed herself as much pleased

with her agreeable and intelligent visitor. Mrs Burnet, on her part, was evidently charmed by the spritely old Princess; "she asked many questions of England, the "Queen etc.," though only "of common things." Englishmen were about her, and the Court had an English air. She spoke strongly, as behoved a loyal German, concerning the insolence of France; and said King James' son had done himself much harm by remaining there and had better have gone to Vienna.

"Such things," comments Mrs Burnet, "she says with "great simplicity and without ill-meaning, [though] people "go away with wrong impressions; for when I said, the "good of a whole nation was too great a sacrifice...to be "made for the humour of a single person, she seemed "to be fully persuaded of it. She...loved her mother's "relations and many things she says comes from those "springs."

Of religion the Electress spoke unguardedly. She seemed inclined to Necessitarianism, but not to impiety; for she had been prepossessed against the Duchess of Marlborough by those who charged her with scepticism. "She always spoke of the Queen with great respect and "kindness." England she thought "inconstant. She "believed if the Queen died to-day, she should succeed "to-morrow, and her children after her; but the Queen "might live twelve year, and things might change; and she "knew not how fit her son, a stranger to all, might be."

The visit, which excited all the comment which had been expected, ended with September. At Rotterdam, Marlborough waited on Mrs Burnet, discussed his recent interview with Lord Peterborough, and sent the lady home again in a yacht.

The summer campaign had proved disastrous to the Allies. The crushing defeat of Almanza in the spring might perhaps have been counterbalanced by success in the great attack on Toulon; "God be thanked," wrote Burnet to the Primate on August 27, "for the good "prospect we have [there]." But he adds an ominous postscript; "this was writ before we had the bad news." The scheme in fact had miscarried, and the Allies had been forced to raise the crucial siege.

Burnet's zeal and Burnet's hopes, however, survived this cruel blow. Responding to the farewell missive of a Venetian envoy (sent to England by that neutral State on a special mission in the spring of 1707), he regrets that himself and his friends had not shown more ample civilities. But rumour had credited His Excellency with designs of mediation; and, says Burnet, "nous ne croyons "pas que le pouvoir de l'oppresseur soit encore suffisamment "abattu; et nous espérons que quoique un grand dessein "n'ait pas réussi cette année, le succès en est réservé "pour une autre."

At home, meanwhile, intestine dissensions were shattering the Coalition Ministry. Conscious of superior strength, the Whigs were gradually ousting the Tory element. After long manœuvres (in which Mrs Burnet had borne part), they had in December 1706 forced Lord Sunderland, son-in-law of the Marlboroughs, into a Secretaryship of State. His arrogance was proverbial; and the appointment seemed a disagreeable necessity even to Marlborough himself, who knew his son-in-law too well. Under the combined insolence of the new Secretary, and of his imperious mother-in-law, not only his reluctant colleague Harley, but even the Queen herself, soon writhed in impotent resentment. This dislike rapidly extended itself to Sunderland's Whig allies; thence it spread to their patrons, Marlborough and Godolphin, and in the long run applied to the war interest generally. A common cause drew Secretary and Sovereign together; and Harley's cousin in the Bed-chamber afforded means of communication. This clandestine intercourse soon excited suspicion; and the resulting jealousies are delicately indicated by Burnet while writing to the Primate, August 27. "When "I was at Althorpe," he observes, "...I complained of the "opening of letters, but it was to the innocent person. "Whether his brother-in-office knows anything of it, I "cannot tell; I daresay he does not....I find our friends "are so much out of humour that I am afraid it may have "ill effects; but you will have more of this from the bearer "[the Bishop of Ely] than I think fit to write."

Isolated, in fact, from his colleagues in office, Harley now began to intrigue with the ultra-Tory opposition.

From September onward the Ministerial breach, despite the duplicity of Harley, had become almost public property; and by the time the first Parliament of Great Britain was on the eve of meeting the tension had become acute. A deadlock could not be prolonged; it was clear someone must resign. Marlborough and Godolphin were distracted. The General deprecated a final break with the Tories; while the Treasurer feared the Whigs, whose zeal for the war rendered them in fact indispensable. For them the two leaders at length definitely declared; and thus defied the Queen.

The struggle was keen. At one moment, early in February,—thanks to the Queen's support, and despite the discovery of grave irregularities in his office—it seemed that Harley might gain the day. Marlborough and Godolphin, in fact actually sent in their resignations. For such a course, however, opinion was by no means ready. The Whigs had a majority in the Cabinet; and at the dramatic Council meeting of February 8, whereof Burnet gives us the description, refused to enter upon business without the two great men. Even Harley advised surrender; they were accordingly reinstated. Harley received his dismissal; while all his adherents, St John included, anticipated their fate by resigning.

The Whigs had at last triumphed.

Bitter was the mortification of the Queen; and proportionate the delight of the zealous Whigs, and the war-party in general. Mrs Burnet's letter to the Duchess is a veritable pæan. To her "the late victory" seems as great as any Marlborough had won. She is indignant that the Duke and Godolphin "should be put one moment in the "balance with Mr Harley and his party, who in all respects "have appeared so far inferior to what they were ever "thought to be." Moreover "this accident" has shown that "however displeased some may be for particular "matters" yet all have a sense "of the great obligations we "are under" and of "the merit of the Lord Treasurer and the "Duke." Almost all the Whigs were prepared, she says, to resign; "and not only the Bishop of Salisbury but most of "the other Bishops would have come and offered...all the "service in their power." She prays the Treasurer and the

Duke may "improve the good understanding...this has laid "the foundation of, with all wise honest men that love the "Queen" (*i.e.* we presume the Whigs); "for I am sure they "are the only friends that can be relied on."

We doubt however whether Burnet was as pleased as was his zealous spouse. That his sympathies were entirely with the war-party cannot be doubted; but he was as yet, at any rate, by no means a pure partisan. He wished to engage all parties in the prosecution of the war; and it is possible that he at this time rather favoured the policy of the more moderate members of the party, who were restive under the arrogance of certain among the leaders. We shall find him, some ten months later, employing language which suggests that he would have preferred a continuance of the Coalition to a Ministry purely Whig.

But Marlborough and Godolphin had now burnt their boats; if indeed those astute politicians ever thoroughly burnt anything which might prove of subsequent service. The fervour of their Whig supporters was soon aroused by an abortive Franco-Jacobite attempt on Scotland, which was headed by the "Pretender" himself, and which exasperated even the Queen; and a general election in May returned a Whig majority. This naturally produced a demand for definitely Whig appointments to all such great offices as were still held by "War" Tories. It was endorsed by Marlborough and Godolphin, but long kept at bay by the inveterate repugnance of the Queen.

Burnet seems to have been detained that winter unusually late in London; for instead of attending his triennial visitation, he had sent down a charge, dated April 15. In general appropriate, it is marred by not a few of the irrelevant political diatribes so irritating to his clerical hearers. An allusion to the recent invasion might pass muster. The description of the war as righteous and essentially defensive touched on more disputed ground; while Burnet's eulogy of the Ministry; his hopes that "the language of faction... "and repining" appropriate to "the sons of Belial" is not "so much as heard" among his clergy are not likely to have endeared him to the Tory portion of his flock.

Not four months later, another great success raised Burnet's enthusiasm to its height. Splendid as were the

achievements of the campaign, it has been very generally held that the great victory at Oudenarde (June 30, 1708) was not sufficiently improved; and Burnet's original narrative[1] reports, though without endorsing, the current impression that a speedy termination of the war would have run counter to Marlborough's interests. At the time however the triumph seemed almost to herald a dash on Paris itself; and Burnet probably anticipated such a consummation, and a Peace on even Whig terms. For the so-called *Conclusion* of his *History* dates from the summer of 1708; and contemplates the prospect of a Peace which should bring the work to its close.

This famous epilogue, written, like all Burnet's best productions, on the spur of the moment, is justly reckoned among the very finest of his efforts. It is in fact a great political sermon, on the text of his preceding pages; the solemn farewell exhortation of the veteran preacher to the nation he had so voluminously addressed. Stately in its masculine simplicity, by places impassioned, it rises, in matter as in style, to the height of its lofty argument; and sums up in fifty terse pages the teaching of his career.

The exordium develops the professed aim of his *History*. "My intention," he says, "...was not so much to "tell a fine tale...and...amuse [the world] with a discovery "of many secrets...to disgrace one party and to recommend "another; it was to give such a discovery of errors in "government, and of the excesses and follies of parties, as "may make the next age wiser by what I may tell them of "the last." His object, therefore, is in the main moral.

What practical reforms, we may ask, does this student of his own time advocate? Firstly, the suppression of electoral corruption; and secondly, *the discouragement of party spirit*. His language (with the reprobation extended, some few months later, to the corrupt tactics of the Whigs) proves to how great an extent, despite his political sympathies, he had, in principle at least, preserved his political independence; how far he still was from the days when he could be described as "party mad." For "this great division of the nation "into Whig and Tory" is by Burnet passionately deprecated. It might, he thinks, "be lessened if not quite removed"

[1] Which henceforth becomes again available (see *supra* p. 339).

could the honest on either side attain to mutual comprehension. "There are many of the Tories that without doubt "look to St Germain and France; but these [dare not own "this] to the bulk of their party. Many infidels, who hate "all religion and all Churches alike (being only against the "Church of England because it is in possession) do join "with the Whigs"; but the party in general is not atheistic. To "undeceive" and unite the best of each party would be work for a great Prince.

Next in his list of reforms comes the codification of English law; a task, in his original draught, reserved for Somers; whose zeal for Law Reform he realised, but who, in point of fact, survived him only a year.

In the fourth place he puts the abrogation of the Elizabethan Poor Law; whereof the principles are repudiated (says Burnet) by the wealth of Holland as by the poverty of Scotland. In its stead he sketches a scheme of what is now called "Charity organization."

He further recommends shorter Parliamentary Sessions, with longer sittings; and a reversion to the "good old" opening hours of 9 and 10 in the morning. He regrets the absence of State at the Court of Queen Anne; drops a quaint unpractical hint as to a sort of "school for Statesmen"; advocates liberal appointments for judges with a view to judicial purity; and the remission of sentences on judicial advice alone[1].

The remainder of Burnet's conclusion is of less immediate interest, since in general it covers ground with which we are already familiar. To each class of the community in turn, to traders and commonalty, gentry, nobility and clergy his warnings apply. "My thoughts," he says, "have "run most and dwelt longest on the concerns of the Church "and religion"; but here we need only notice one little personal touch; the regretful allusion to the "pomp of

[1] It is noteworthy that during the succeeding session he also voted for the assimilation of the Scotch to the English law of Treason; though as an historian he appreciated the voluminous documentary apparatus of the Scotch method. He also favoured the abolition of forfeiture of estate on conviction for treason; but with the discreditable proviso that such mitigating amendments should only come in force on the accession of the Hanoverian house. He further approved the naturalization of foreign Protestants, even when not conformists. (*Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.] II. 520–5.)

"living"—the "high tables"—which "custom has imposed "on those provided with plentiful Bishoprics." "I," he confesses (and we recall with some amusement the fulminations of his boyish *Memorial*), "had not strength enough "to break through that."

His portrait of the ideal country gentleman is graceful and appreciative. "Some such instances," he admits, "are yet "left among us, but alas! there are not many of them." To him the English gentry, in general, seemed "for the "most part the worst instructed...of any of their rank I ever "went amongst; the Scotch, though less able to bear the "expense of a learned education, are much more knowing." In England, we fear (as in Ireland), Berkeley's taunt that the eldest son had the privilege of the worst education was for some time later warrantable; but Burnet's spleen was no doubt intensified by the fact that the Tory extremists drew their strength from the ranks of the Squires. "As for "the men of trade and business"—(who usually voted Whig) —these, though too ostentatious in their hospitality, too sedentary in their habits, and too much devoted to social intercourse, he estimates "the best body in the nation, "generous, sober...charitable," well-educated and devout.

Passing to matters of detail, he criticises severely the immorality of the contemporary stage, which he contrasts with the purity of the actual French drama; denounces the prevalence of gambling, and the taste for sottish conviviality.

His remarks on the education of boys who have no turn for the classics, are here, as ever, admirably just; and he certainly favoured the higher instruction of women. For after deprecating the mercenary marriages which even the graver opinion of his day so decidedly encouraged, he argues, that in the choice of a wife the main essentials are "a good understanding, good principles...a good temper, "*a liberal education* and acceptable person." The feminine boarding-school of the day, with its trivial curriculum, was his aversion; and though he is said to have discouraged the schemes of the celebrated Mary Astell, he advocated "Academies," to be devoted to women's education and religious retreat; "monasteries without vows [which] might "be so set on foot as to be the honour of a Queen on the "throne."

Finally, he winds up with the famous eulogy of true religion; and the stately pathetic peroration, which pleads the experience of his own long life as a proof that such religion—"the earnest of that supreme joy which I pant... "for"—can alone satisfy the soul.

Meanwhile, however, the victory of Oudenarde had by means brought the Peace which this eloquent appeal anticipates; nor had it encouraged at home the scheme of a fusion of parties which certain dissensions among the Whigs had perhaps suggested. His defeat had certainly quickened in Louis a desire for the end of the war; but it had proportionally enhanced the arrogance of the English Whigs. And that party now claimed to represent the English nation. The Queen's long opposition to the complete reorganization of the Cabinet was beaten down, by a brutality of tactics which the Queen never forgave; the threat of a Parliamentary attack on the dying husband whom she loved. From October 1708 onwards the Ministry was almost purely Whig; and to the Spring of 1709 belongs the well-known "Halifax" address, which practically committed the party to a relentless prosecution of the war.

For the rigorous winter of 1708–9 had reduced France to more than the verge of famine; and by February Louis was at length driven to reluctant overtures for peace. After the failure of his attempt to detach Holland from the Alliance, conferences began in April; only to be broken off in the June following. The blame has been almost universally laid on the Allies; who demanded, in addition to the cession of the entire Spanish monarchy, the restoration of Alsace and Strasburg; the demolition of Dunkirk; a barrier for the Dutch, and the aggrandisement of Savoy; exacting, moreover, pledges from France for the fulfilment of the main conditions. Klopp has however argued, with great plausibility, that the onus of the rupture really lies on the Dauphin, who imperiously pressed the cause of his son in Spain; and that the proclamations, which laid the blame of the renewed strife on the wound inflicted upon French pride, were a masterpiece of diplomatic duplicity. But none the less is it permissible to doubt the wisdom of the Allies. If reasonable, severally considered, thus accumulated their demands were staggering. It was not the true

interest of Europe that France should be utterly pulverized; and the publication of conditions so onerous, with the astute comments of Louis, provoked a violent reaction not only in the minds of the French themselves, but even in England and Holland. Moreover it was the height of folly to allow the negotiations to be ostensibly ruptured on the French point of honour. Had the Allies forthwith required France to formulate an alternative, they would have thrown the onus of hostilities upon the other side.

Burnet, however, whose account of the matter agrees very fairly, in the main, with the one endorsed by Klopp, could see no fault in the conduct of the Ministry; he forgot his own apologue concerning Philip II, who so long had peace in his hands that he failed to secure it. Yet the parallel held good. For from this time forth the cause of the Allies declined; and more rapidly rose the peace fervour of the English nation.

To Burnet, this pacific ardour seemed a proof of national depravity; but no such explanation is needed. Weary of the burdens entailed by a struggle from which they were permitted to reap no tangible result, men regarded with a growing resentment our disproportionate contribution to its cost; while the clergy, hard pressed by war taxation, were doubly exasperated by the renewed abeyance of Convocation. Meanwhile ministerial bellicosity excited invidious suspicion; for the rapacity of Marlborough and the Whigs rose by leaps and bounds. The sting of Whig insolence was felt even by Marlborough and Godolphin; and Somers alone redeemed the character of the "Junto." The Queen, shrinking equally from the half-insane violence of Duchess Sarah and from the arrogance of Sunderland and his friends, leaned more and more on the secret support of Harley; who skilfully fanned the flames of general discontent.

Some manœuvres which he ultimately endorsed, if he did not originally inspire them, are not very much to his honour. The *New Atalantis* (vols. 1 and 2) appeared in May 1709; and it is strange to find men of decent morals, such as were Harley and Swift, countenancing the veiled and often baseless calumnies of a woman of ill-fame. In these initial volumes, Burnet escapes fairly well, since he is only charged, in general terms, with supineness in divine worship

—susceptibility to "the snares of beauty...pride, faction "and some other vices."

Slander, however, at this time, must have failed to move him, for his mind was engrossed by a great domestic blow. The apparent benefit which his wife had derived from the waters of "the Spa" proved but transitory. She bore unexpectedly well the awful frosts of 1708, but the thaw of January 27, 1708–9, brought on a chill; she died February 3.

In her will, dated September 7, 1705, she had professed herself a member of the Church of England, but in communion of charity with all Christians, such especially as are pure of idolatry. She desired burial by the side of her first husband, in accordance with a promise, and not "out of any "want of respect or kindness to my present husband, who "has, by his great kindness and confidence, deserved from "me all...gratitude...love and respect." To him she bequeathed her gold watch, the goods she had brought into his house, and a life interest in her estate at St John's, Clerkenwell.

Within a fortnight report credited her husband with having actually contracted a fourth marriage. But nothing seems to have been farther from his thoughts. He made immediate arrangements for the reissue of his wife's devotional *Method* with a biographical preface. This, as he ingenuously admits, he himself "dictated for the greatest part, Dr Goodwin whose "name is to it, only writing so much" as might just warrant the ascription. His autobiography, written more than eighteen months later, evinces his reverence for her memory; and though his bereavement did not affect his energy, which continued unabated; though he still preached indefatigably, was still constant to Parliamentary duties in town, to diocesan labour in the country, he no longer cared for purely social intercourse. And in order that he might avoid "the distraction of useless visits" he took up his abode when in London at the secluded dwelling his dead wife had left him.

For Clerkenwell, in the early eighteenth century, was but a growing suburb on the northern verge of the metropolis, looking north, across fields, towards the *villages* of Islington and Highbury. There, within a stone's throw of

the then open country, on the site of the dissolved Priory of St John of Jerusalem, lay an irregular quadrangle of houses and gardens, "St John's Court" now St John's Square. The new thoroughfare, Clerkenwell Road, has altered the character of this area; which in Burnet's time was entered to the north and east by narrow passages, both named after Jerusalem; while its southern end, then as now, debouched under "St John's Gate" (now appropriated by the revived Order) into St John's Lane. This latter led almost directly into the great paved space, haunted by memories of the Marian persecution; but known to Londoners of the day as the Smithfield of Bartholomew Fair.

Most of the houses in the Court belonged to wealthy men. At the north-east extremity, the chapel of the Priory survived. Now St John's Church, known for its fine crypt, it was then a dissenting chapel. "Burnet House," which (though early partitioned into tenements) retained its distinctive name till destroyed in the nineteenth century, stood at the south-west end. It is described as handsome and stately, with gardens in front and rear, the old Priory wall bounding the garden behind.

Here he "grew more abstracted from the world" than his former career had permitted. His house was still frequented by such as came on business, and by those who attended at the Sunday evening exposition; to which (though originally designed for the benefit of his household) "many "persons of distinction resorted." "I had," records Speaker Onslow, "admittance to...one of these lectures; it was upon "the new heavens and...earth, after the general conflagration. "He first read to us the chapter in St Peter, where this is "described; then enlarged upon it with that force of imagina- "tion and solemnity of speech and manner—the subject "suiting his genius—as to make this remembrance to "affect me extremely even now" after a period of nearly forty years. Social intercourse however was confined to "his most "select and intimate acquaintance." The tentative enumeration given by his son includes the Marlboroughs, Godolphin, and various distinguished members of the Whig party, Scotch or English. It is however very important to notice that his sympathies, Whig though they were, lay almost exclusively with the more moderate and statesmanlike Right

Wing of the party—represented in England by Somers and Cowper, in Scotland by Baillie of Jerviswood. The three most violent members of the Whig Junto—Sunderland, Orford, Wharton—are conspicuously absent from the list. Such exclusive intercourse however with the members of a single party cannot have tended to enlarge the political views of the Bishop.

Meanwhile during the summer of 1709 discontent was rapidly increasing. It was intensified in September by the costly victory of Malplaquet, where the French troops fought with the ferocity of despair; it was embittered in October by the exorbitance of the Barrier guaranteed to our Dutch ally, in return for a counter guarantee of the English Protestant succession; it was aggravated by Marlborough's demand of the Captain-Generalcy for life; and enhanced if possible in November, by the elevation of another Whig to the last Ministerial vacancy.

It was in fact, at the acme of apparent Whig triumph that the reaction found sudden vent. The seditiously "Tory" sermon preached at St Paul's, on the eve of the Session, by the contemptible Dr Sacheverell, and reprobated at the moment even by the Queen herself, was an occasion and not a cause.

Burnet himself had been personally insulted in the sermon; and Sacheverell, with smooth insolence, had fortified his "non-resistance" theories with citations from Burnet's early works. Yet Burnet, like Somers, saw the utter folly of the impeachment; which excited the sympathies of every High Churchman in favour of the "perse-" "cuted" priest. Burnet indeed contrived to remain out of London till about January 12, 1709–10, when the impeachment at length reached the House of Lords.

Proceedings actually began with February 27. A night or two later a "Tory" mob—fostered it was said by influential outsiders, and reinforced no doubt by the parishioners of Sacheverell (for he held a London living)—attacked the meeting houses of the Metropolis. The rabble invaded St John's Court, and "gutted" the chapel there. A man was killed on Burnet's very doorstep; the house being only saved by the opportune arrival of troops.

A riot, said one of the Harleys, appears a poor tribute

to the principle of passive obedience. The partizans of Sacheverell, however, a few zealots excepted, were not concerned with theories, but with the question of the War. The speeches of the prosecuting Whigs may embody, as Burke asserts they do embody, the pure Whig doctrine on the subject of resistance. They may, as was argued at the time, have given some umbrage to the Queen; they may have accustomed the crowd to hear the "Pre-"tender" discussed as inferentially legitimate in birth though not by title. But after all, Sacheverell's counsel (whose discretion compared favourably with his own) unreservedly admitted the validity of the Revolution settlement. They fell back on the plea that obedience, as the general rule, may be rightly urged without reference to exceptional cases. Language (so they argued) as unqualified as that of Sacheverell, had been employed, without rebuke, by the greatest Anglican divines. They cited, *inter alia*, Burnet's *Sermon on Subjection*; which had been specially reprinted for the purpose in December preceding. A similar excerpt from the *Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland* [pp. 41–2] brought a manager to his feet. He compelled the addition of the qualifying clause, which refers to "total subversion"; and its disingenuous omission evoked severe comment. Burnet himself, in a fine historical retrospect, traced the genesis of the "divine right" dogma; *deducing its gradual evolution from the Reformation doctrine: That the Civil power possesses a direct commission from on high, independent of ecclesiastical sanction.* The quotations from the *Homily against Wilful Rebellion* (on which Sacheverell specially relied) Burnet parried by references to Jewell, its reputed author, who elsewhere distinguishes between Wilful Rebellion and National Self-defence; and the careers of Elizabeth and James I afforded actual examples of interference on behalf of so-called rebels. The reign of Charles I brings the speaker on delicate ground; but he extricates himself with admirable dexterity. The twelve years during which the dogma of Divine Right was triumphant initiated, he hints, all the ensuing troubles. The Civil War, "which I do "own was plainly a rebellion" with the "blood of that "blessed King," are not chargeable on the doctrine of resist-

ance, but on doubt of the King's good faith; and Burnet appeals on this point to the Hamilton manuscripts—to the statements of Holles and Grimston—to "the noble "account given by the Earl of Clarendon." After the "happy" Restoration slavery might have come in, but for "the firmness of the Earl of Clarendon to his English "principles." All this is obviously genuine; but it is also very clever; for Queen Anne—the grandchild of Charles and of Clarendon—attended during the debates. Equally astute is the reminder that High Churchmen and Oxford Dons had signed the "Association" of 1688. The recent reaction in favour of the Right Divine dogma Burnet traces, in terms sufficiently clear, to the ambition of Atterbury—the machinations of Leslie and his friends.

But this fencing was really academic. The crux of the matter was, that Sacheverell, in the metropolitan Cathedral, had publicly insulted the existing administration. On this point Burnet, as second to the notorious Lord Wharton, "spoke with vehemency." Sacheverell, he said, by "in-"veighing against the Revolution, Toleration and Union, "seemed to arraign and attack the Queen herself"; since she "had so great a share in the first; and had often "declared that she would maintain the second; and that "she looked upon the third as the most glorious event of "her reign." Here again Burnet claims a "very palpable hit." Moreover "nothing could be more plain than [Sacheverell's] "reflecting on Her Majesty's Ministers; and that he had in "particular so well marked out a noble peer there present[1] "by an ugly and scurrillous epithet (which he would not "repeat[2]) that it was not possible to mistake him. Upon "this some of the younger Peers fell a laughing, and cried "out 'Name him! Name him!' But the Lord Chancellor "interposed, declaring 'That no peer was obliged to say "'but what he thought fit.'"

Eventually Burnet voted with the majority which condemned Sacheverell; but as he was only sentenced to a three years' inhibition from preaching and the burning of the obnoxious sermon, his friends represented the result as a virtual acquittal. This meant that it was a virtual triumph for the Tories, and in general for the advocates of peace;

[1] Godolphin. [2] Volpone.

and the issue showed the growing strength of that party. The nation declared for Sacheverell; bonfires, illuminations, addresses, announced the general delight.

This significant outburst first taught the Queen herself the extent and vehemence of the reaction; and strengthened her to shake off a yoke which became daily more insupportable. Burnet unconsciously did his best to clinch the Royal resolution. If his speeches at the trial had been marked by courtly tact, the same cannot be said of his private admonitions.

During the proceedings, he tells us, he had been "encouraged by the Queen to speak more freely to her of "her affairs, than" (as he says) "I had ever ventured to do "formerly." Perhaps the encouragement originated in his own lively imagination; he certainly seized the opportunity with his usual maladroit zeal. The pleasing topic he thrust before his long-suffering Sovereign was a report "secretly "spread...through the nation" that she favoured the scheme for an eventual Stuart restoration, to take place on her own decease. The rumours (which, sooth to say, have a good deal in their favour) Burnet derived from Scotch nobles "in "the secret with the professed Jacobites."—Upon this "I," says Burnet, "...said, if she was capable of making such a "bargain for herself...as it would darken all the glory of her "reign, so it must set all her people to consider of the most "proper ways of securing themselves by bringing over the "Protestant successors; in which I told her plainly I would "concur, if she did not take effectual means to extinguish "those jealousies....I also showed her that if she suffered the "Pretender's party to prepare the nation for his succeeding "her she ought not to imagine...they would stay for the "natural end of her life." Moreover her ministers, like those of Queen Elizabeth, "had served her with that fidelity and "such success that her making a change...would amaze all "the world....This," says Burnet innocently, "*with a great* "*deal more to the same purpose*, I laid before the Queen; "she heard me patiently; she was for the most part silent; "yet by what she said she seemed desirous to make me "think she agreed to what I laid before her." He soon, however, realised that her silence was not consent. "Yet," says Burnet, with his inimitable self-complacency, "I had

"great quiet in my mind, since I had, with an honest "freedom, made the best use I could of the access I had "to her."

Queen Anne, in fact, was nerving herself for action. Scarce had Parliament risen, ere, on April 6, 1710, the Queen definitely broke with the Duchess of Marlborough. Shrewsbury, who, though nominally a Whig, had voted for Sacheverell's acquittal, was now brought into the Cabinet; and on June 14 Lord Sunderland, whom the Queen specially abhorred, received his dismissal. At this point matters remained for some time further.

Meanwhile the petty stage of Sarum politics was reflecting the course of affairs. A congratulatory address to the Queen from one of the Sarum Archdeaconries had contained animadversions on the Bishop. A Sacheverell demonstration had taken place at Salisbury. The Bishop, in high dudgeon, had preached at the Corporation; the Corporation had walked out of Church ere the Bishop's next lecture. This undignified squabble had evoked a vigorous pamphlet war; and had even attracted the notice of the Paris Gazette. The quaint and garrulous autobiographical appendix which Burnet, in the following November, after the example of de Thou, drew up for his posthumous *History* includes a heartfelt lament on the Bishop's own part, that he had ever been so foolish as to meddle with local politics.

Nor was this all. The third and fourth volumes of the *New Atalantis* appeared about this date; and in them no measures are kept with the Bishop of Sarum. As the "Patriarch of Nova" or the apostate Bishop of Antioch he is a mark for the foulest slanders. The Tofts' scandal —adorned with luxuriant detail—is laid at his door; the insinuation that not only the *prima donna*, but her mother, had been the Bishop's mistress, is now openly made; and the writer even takes credit for deprecating the conclusion which these premises suggest.

Such attacks, owing to the use of pseudonyms, were safe from prosecution; but Burnet brought an action of *scandalum magnatum* against one of the Salisbury Aldermen "who "said he had preached lies." Burnet obtained a verdict for £100; largely upon the evidence of a Nonconformist

minister. This sum, with his wonted generosity, he devoted to the improvement of the road across Salisbury Plain. A "Person of Quality" (we are told) once breathed a devout aspiration that a few more such actions might smooth his road to London.

Meanwhile, as already hinted, the reorganization of the Ministry hung fire. The ambitions of Harley were in truth purely personal. Though long head of an Opposition mainly Tory, he had, in fact, no specifically Tory sympathies. His desire was to resume the coalition system pursued at the beginning of the reign; and therein he was completely in accord with the Queen. Strong as were her Church sympathies, she deprecated a Tory tyranny; and wished to rally all moderate men to the support of her own throne. For some time it looked as if their policy might succeed; and we are moreover tempted to believe, from various indications, that Burnet inclined to concur. His *Conclusion* of 1708 hints a wish for the fusion of parties. Sunderland did not rank among his personal friends; and Lord Dartmouth who succeeded him[1] was not unacceptable to Somers and his allies. But in the excited state of public feeling, common action between the parties was really impossible. Moreover the head of a Coalition Ministry must be either strong or popular; and Harley who, though an astute Parliamentarian, has never been described as strong, was almost as much distrusted by the Tories as by the Whigs. The trend of public feeling automatically brought in the Tories. On August 7 Godolphin was cashiered; Harley became Chancellor of the Exchequer; and September 20–22 saw the dismissal of all his Whig colleagues.

In October a General Election (the scene so Burnet declared of unlimited Tory malpractices) resulted in the return of an enthusiastically Tory majority; and this was met on the opening of Parliament, November 25, 1710, by an administration definitely Tory.

Impetuous, however, as was Burnet's temper, he was at heart more of a patriot than he was a partizan. The War, the Toleration, the Succession, were the real objects of his zeal; and since "the new scene of the Ministers" (so he wrote on November 16) professed their intention of acting

[1] Known to us as a commentator on Burnet.

"very moderately at home, and very steadily with relation "to the War and to the alliances abroad" he seems to have hoped at first that men, not measures, were at stake.

The ensuing Session, however, dashed all his hopes. Whatever the professions of the leaders, they were dependent on the undisciplined, and in many cases Jacobite, zealots whom the wave of party enthusiasm had carried to the fore. To restrain this turbulent majority would have taxed a firm hand; under the jealous reserve of a Harley, the brilliant instability, the impetuous passions of a St John—both suffering moreover under the stigma of Whig associations—the October Club was master of the situation. If generous estimates were at first voted for the War, party rancour dictated the remaining measures of the Session; while in Convocation the Ministry was dragged at the imperious Atterbury's chariot-wheel.

Worse still, in Burnet's eyes, was the anxiety of the Government for the consummation of that peace, in favour of which it had received so very decisive a mandate. This anxiety, latent at first, was speedily quickened by bad news from Spain, and by the very alarming state of the Eastern Question. Moreover, the succession in April of the Spanish Hapsburg to the Austrian dominions, and his election in October to the Imperial throne, together with the obstinate adherence of the Spanish majority to the cause of the Bourbon claimant, gave some pretext for a compromise as regards the Spanish monarchy.

Juster was Burnet's verdict on the discreditable clandestine negotiations which occupied the spring. These issued in secret preliminaries granting special terms to England; and in the preliminaries publicly transmitted to our allies in October, which tacitly resigned Spain and the Indies, on condition that France and Spain should never acknowledge one King. These terms, as Burnet complains, were indeed "very different" from those of 1709; but the Whigs, in so far as they had been concerned in letting "the good hour" slip, were hardly entitled to resent this Sibylline penalty.

The Autumn Session of 1711 was postponed till a date should have been fixed for the desired Peace Congress; and meanwhile, says Burnet, "pains were taken on many persons "to persuade them to agree to the measures [of] the Court....

"Among others, the Queen spoke to myself; she said, she "hoped Bishops would not be against peace. I said, a good "peace was what we daily prayed for; but the preliminaries "offered by France gave no great hopes of such an one; "and the trusting to the King of France's faith, after all "that had passed, would seem a strange thing." The Queen begged him to suspend his judgment; whereon "I," says Burnet, "asked leave to speak my mind plainly, which "she granted." Upon this cue the zealous Bishop spoke till, as he innocently says, "I saw she grew uneasy, so "I withdrew." The surrender of Spain and the West Indies to King Philip must, so he argued, "in a little while "deliver up all Europe into the hands of France," and ruin both Queen and country; within three years "she would "be murdered and the fires would be again raised in "Smithfield."

This terrible syllogism failed to convince the Queen. In truth, Burnet's politics, like those of many able contemporaries, were thirty years behind the times. Ideas, branded into the mind at moments of crisis, are apt to survive the conditions that gave them birth; the France of 1711 was not the France of 1689, or even of 1700. Sixteen years of almost continuous warfare, and of ruinous finance, had temporarily exhausted her energy, though not the tenacity of her rulers; and if still unyielding in defence she was not strong enough for defiance. The continental situation had been transformed by the death of the Emperor Joseph, and the repugnance of the Spaniards for the Hapsburgs; and a partition treaty—framed much upon the lines of King William's original scheme—not unfairly represented the facts of the *status quo*. Criticism of the Utrecht negotiation must turn less on the ends in view than on the spirit and methods by which these were pursued.

Parliament eventually met on December 7, to receive formal intimation that with the New Year the Congress would assemble at Utrecht. The secession of the Tory Lord Nottingham, who had been among the first to insist on the recovery of Spain for the Hapsburgs, strengthened the War interest in the Lords; which carried, by eight votes, a motion censuring any peace which should leave Spain and the Indies to the Bourbons. But this triumph

had to be paid for. An "Occasional Conformity Bill," comparatively modest in its scope, was Nottingham's darling measure. The Whigs could refuse nothing to their new ally; the Bill, duly introduced and carried by Whig votes, remained on the Statute Book for a period of seven years. Burnet, who had abetted the intrigue, has the grace to condemn so very cynical a bargain. He can but plead the importance of dividing the Tories; the dread of a more drastic measure at the hands of the October Club.

The Ministry, thus vigorously attacked, acted with vigour. The simultaneous creation of twelve peers re-established a majority in the Lords. The studied insults of a year had not secured Marlborough's resignation, and he was now openly appearing as a leader among the Whigs. A hostile Parliamentary Commission charged him with peculation; on December 31 he was summarily cashiered.

It was inevitable that the parallel with Belisarius should be actively pressed. The historical knowledge of the Duchess was probably on a par with that of her husband; whose remark to the Bishop, that Shakespeare, as acted on the stage, had taught him all the history he knew, has been frequently quoted. She is said to have questioned the Bishop as to the facts of Belisarius' disgrace; to receive the too opportune response that among other causes of misfortune he possessed "a brimstone of a wife!"

A yet more characteristic specimen of Burnet's conversational blunders is relegated to the few days following. Prince Eugene had come to London to press the Emperor's interests; much to the disgust of the Ministry (who charged him with the most heinous projects), and to the corresponding delight of the Whigs. Marlborough invited him to an entertainment; and Burnet, desirous to meet so distinguished a man, begged that he might be present. Marlborough, fearing, we presume, lest the Bishop should monopolise the "lion," evinced some hesitation. Burnet promised discretion, and duly kept in the background; but the Prince asking his name, they entered into discourse. The Prince made inquiries concerning a visit of Burnet to Paris. Burnet identified the year by the fact that the Comtesse de Soissons then stood her trial as a poisoner. A look from Marlborough recalled to him that

he spoke of the Prince's mother; and, losing his head completely, he made bad worse by an apology ere he precipitately retired from the scene. This ill-starred beginning does not seem to have compromised their subsequent relations. Burnet was admitted "at several times, "to much discourse" with the Prince; and was particularly struck by the unassuming modesty characteristic of the chivalrous General[1].

Meanwhile January 16 had been proclaimed a day of fasting and prayer for the success of the peace negotiations; and Burnet preached at the Temple. A legal auditory, we presume, is nothing if not critical; but the effect of Burnet's oratory was on this occasion overwhelming. For his theme he significantly selected the iniquities of Rome. "He set "[these] forth," records Onslow, "...with such force of "speech and action (for he had much of that in his "preaching at all times) *that I have never seen an audience "anywhere so much affected as we...were.*" This compliment is startling; for Onslow wrote after a Speakership of thirty-three years, which included the oratorical apogee of the elder Pitt's career.

Burnet's indignation and alarms soon found a Parliamentary vent. Even if the ministerial policy be pronounced in its essence sound, the cause was more than compromised by more than questionable tactics. The disgraceful episode of the "restraining orders" sent to Ormond in face of the enemy, and the proposal to rely on French honour for the permanent separation of the Crowns, evoked from the House of Lords determined minority protests, which were expunged by order of the House. In the first of these Burnet concurred.

Nor was the domestic policy of the Government, especially as to Scotch affairs, less offensive to Burnet's sentiments. Nearly five years before, in a letter to Tenison, he had complained with honest warmth of the "strange management" which almost seemed designed

[1] The stories of Burnet's fatal candour seem to have been almost endless. Another relates, that when a grandson of his old friend Lady Balcarres was introduced to him by Lady Stair, he electrified the company by enquiring after "that wicked wretch, Lady Wigton"—who happened to be the young man's sister. It is said that he himself realised his inadvertence; and would never call on his friend Lady Mar, dreading what he might say of her husband.

to "inflame matters" in Scotland. Had France at the moment been in a condition to "assist" that country he should have entertained "very melancholy apprehensions." Harley had been at some pains to investigate Scotch opinion; but it was reserved for the ministry which was nominally under his control, to complete the process of insult. An Act securing liberty of worship to the Scotch Episcopalians was certainly required; for they had had reason to realise that Connivance is not (as Burnet would have had them believe) identical with Toleration. Episcopal ministers—Greenshields is the crucial instance—had been imprisoned for using within the walls of their own meeting-house the Prayer-book of the English Church. But though more than defensible in aim, the Act so passed was both in conception and in terms needlessly offensive to the Presbyterians; while the Acts which restored patronage and enforced on the Scottish law courts a Christmas vacation admit of no excuse. They were either the thin dishonest end of an Episcopal wedge; or an ebullition of ignorant folly—the blunder which is worse than a crime. Wodrow records, on the authority, once removed of Carstares, "that "in the time of the dependence of the Bill of Patronages, "he and his two followers waited on Bishop Burnet, and "after some conversation with him, he told them: 'Gentle-"'men, I resolve to speak some very free things in the "'House on that subject, and I will tell them, I noticed "'the King of France to proceed just in this way in "'revoking the Edict of Nantes, and piece by piece, he "'wore in, and at length took it away, and turned "'persecutor.'" Burnet appears to have let slip, in correspondence [?] with the old Duchess of Hamilton, the expression of a belief that "the Church of Scotland would "never be fully right till the National Covenant were "renewed (or somewhat equivalent) to prevent Popery." He is also said to have evinced sympathy with many of the former Covenanting sufferers.

It is in any case certain that Burnet's opposition to the Government measures, just though it were, was marred by his usual want of tact. Mr Greenshields, when requesting the Bishop's assistance towards an ill-timed consignment

of English prayer-books for Scotland, was no doubt deliberately guilty of gross impertinence; but it was weak of Burnet to fall into so obvious a trap. His anger may well have given the High Churchmen a welcome occasion of proclaiming that the Presbyterian Bishop abandoned to the Kirk full powers of Dogmatic Protection; that he considered the symbolic books of his Communion as a kind of religious contraband, and Greenshields as a spiritual smuggler, running the ecclesiastical blockade.

In Convocation, apart from the usual constitutional squabbles, two incidents alone require attention. During the preceding Session, after Burnet had left for his diocese, both Houses had concurred in censuring the Semi-Arian tenets of the very eccentric Whiston. The revived proceedings now fell through owing to the supineness of the Queen, in general zealously orthodox. "This," says Burnet, "was not unacceptable to some of us, and to "myself in particular...; and I have ever thought that the "true interest of the Christian religion was best consulted, "when nice disputing about mysteries was laid aside and "forgotten."

The abstruse metaphysics of Whiston were certainly not of a kind to affect public opinion; and Burnet, moreover, welcomed Whiston as an ally against Deistical controversialists. But Burnet's opponents must have contrasted his leniency in point of dogma with the severity he showed where sacerdotal assumptions were concerned.

Ritualistic doctrines of a somewhat advanced type had arisen among a section of the Non-jurors and a certain school of conforming High Churchmen; and we find Burnet bewailing the failure of two attempts to obtain the censure of Convocation upon tenets of this nature. In his eyes, as in those of White Kennett and even of Leibnitz, sacerdotal developments could bear but one interpretation. "There appeared," he says, "at this time an inclination in "many of the clergy to a nearer approach towards the "Church of Rome." Personal animus perhaps increased his fears; for "Hickes an ill-tempered man" (we pardon the epithet), "who was now at the head of the Jacobite "party," supported this propaganda; promoting in several books "a notion that there was a proper sacrifice" in the

Eucharist. Others went far on the topic of priestly absolution—even exceeding, as Burnet declares, the doctrines of Rome; since they placed priestly absolution on a par with Christ's. Others denounced lay baptism as invalid, even *in extremis*; which, since Nonconformist ministers in their eyes were laymen, placed all Protestant dissenters without the Covenant of Grace.

Among the extreme Ritualistic laymen ranked the learned Non-juror Dodwell, who resided in Burnet's diocese. His quaint theory that immortality is conditioned by the *possibility* of valid baptism, had been censured by Burnet in a sermon of 1710. On the extinction, however, of the original Non-juring episcopate Dodwell had resumed Communion with the Established Church. Early in 1711, in a letter to Burnet, he had accepted his spiritual jurisdiction, and begged the Bishop to undertake the confirmation of his children. He added, however, that while he differed from his "late brethren"—who regarded Burnet's "Resistance" and Erastian principles as *ipso facto* heretical, and excommunicative—this was only because he maintained that no excommunication is valid unless pronounced by the Episcopal bench; which stands as superior to ecclesiastical censure, as does the "Sovereign" power in the state to the physical coercion of the subject.

To this provocative epistle Burnet had mildly responded. He defended his own strictures on the peculiar doctrines of Dodwell. Such doctrines he thought calculated to strengthen the cause of a Vaninus, a Hobbes, or a Spinoza; as they had encouraged the "wicked" views of the "impious" Deist Toland. This stroke was peculiarly happy as Toland was a rank Whig. Nor did Burnet fail to point out the weakness of Dodwell's ecclesiastical standpoint. For Burnet had never obtruded on the see of a Non-juror, and the death of no Bishop, therefore, could affect his diocesan status. The vast learning and exemplary character of Dodwell are fully acknowledged; but Burnet fears he is infected by unconscious intellectual self-conceit. "I am," adds the Bishop, "as much as ever I "was for the doctrine of the Cross, in the case of *legal* "persecution; but an *illegal* one is no better than the 'violence of a robber. And as every soul ought to be

"subjected to the higher powers, so I think the Church "ought to be subject to the State in everything that "is not against natural equity, or the positive laws of "God. As far as these go the Church is independent and "no further." He declines further controversy; makes arrangements for the desired confirmation; and concludes with dignified courtesy.

To this kindly epistle Dodwell returned a polite sarcastic reply. "Primitive Antiquity" he proposed as a standard of "Catholic and Apostolic Revelations," better and broader than the New Testament canon. With this letter went a "little book" written by Dodwell himself against the use of incense.

Burnet's answer is charming. He deprecates aught but an amicable correspondence, and returns thanks for the book, from which he has received much instruction. Its dialectic skill impresses him; "I see you are a master in "every argument you undertake." He is glad that Dodwell minimises the authority of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*, on which Whiston relied; and thinks this should convert Whiston—if indeed anything can! He agrees with Dodwell as to "Father Mabillon," the "best "man I ever knew of that Communion"; and finally presents the young candidates for Confirmation with his own *Exposition of the Catechism*, then fresh from the press.

That doctrines such as those of Dodwell should shock Burnet's Protestant zeal—that the arrogant assumptions of Atterbury should alarm the old Erastian—all this was natural enough. But he quite over-estimated the extent, and misread the significance, of eighteenth century ritualism. It had no real vitality. In its extreme form it was confined to a few pedants, and their immediate disciples; and even in these denoted no sympathy with Rome. Unitarianism and pietism, as Burnet ought well to have realised, were the tendencies of the century which had begun.

Plaintive, however, are Burnet's laments in the last letter which he addressed to the venerable Van Limborch, who had sent him his *Commentary on the Acts, Romans and Hebrews*. "...You do well," he says, "to remind us "that we cannot propose any other method of reforming "Christianity (scarce a trace of whose power remains), save

"by recalling men to the study of the Holy Writings, "and to the simplicity of doctrine therein embodied; and "provoking them to that purity of life and manners which "these breathe throughout. Alas! what hope of attaining "the ends to which such studies should be the means! "Once I had hope of the British Churches; but now I "am forced to lay it mournfully aside. Here all things "rush headlong into the gulf of superstition, and we are "miserably distracted by the rage of parties. God grant "that wearying at length of our disorders, we may return "to the pure source of truth...."

Meanwhile Burnet's own sons were assuming the responsibilities of manhood. In their education, as we have seen, he had spared neither trouble nor cost. After the Leyden episode (1707–8) two of them had gone upon the Grand Tour; spending eight months at Geneva, four months at Rome, and twelve in the rest of Italy. All this, says the Bishop, he arranged for them "at a great charge, "that so they might go into the best companies, and learn "all that was to be learned." Early in 1710 they had returned; "I thank God," wrote their father, "yet pure "and free from all ill impressions; and they have made such "a progress in knowledge that...I do not find the labour "and expense...is lost."

We doubt however if this gratification lasted. His eldest son, the godson of William and Mary, had grown up handsome and accomplished; with far more talent than his idle youth had prognosticated, and with all the conversational facility which his father had once deplored. The stringent religious discipline of the Episcopal household had disgusted him with public worship; and if not actually irreligious, he was very unorthodox in his views. He had gone to the Bar; and about May 1712, contracted (as his younger brother puts it) an imprudent love-match with the beautiful and charming daughter of Dean Stanhope, a High Churchman whom Burnet disliked. Her portion was but £1000, and it is probable that pressure had been put upon her to close with a good match. For though William Burnet had every quality which could attract, he failed to efface the memory of a previous attachment; and she died of a broken heart within three years.

Whether Burnet did or did not approve the marriage he acted with his usual generosity. His presents to his new daughter (valued at £125) included a characteristic offering; "a piece of gold with the Princess Sophia's head." This was probably one of the medals which the Electress had had struck, in honour of the Act of Settlement, for distribution among the notabilities of England.

The bridegroom's fortune of £8000 must have been due to his father's liberality; since the Bishop would have settled it all on the young lady, had not the Dean interposed. It did not however long profit William Burnet. He subsequently plunged into "South Sea" speculation; dying seventeen years later, as Governor of Massachusetts Bay, very deeply in debt.

Gilbert, the second son, had been destined for orders; not, it would appear, greatly to his own satisfaction. Wodrow, who had the information at two removes, declares that he inclined to some form of Unitarianism, probably the semi-Arianism of his friend Dr Clarke; that his favourite reading was the collection of Socinian treatises, known as the *Fratres Poloni*; and that he had often remonstrated with his father on the subject of his intended profession. The Bishop, adds the story, employed his son's friend, Mr Bradbury, the famous Independent minister, to combat this reluctance; and the son, under pressure, complied. Like his brothers, Gilbert Burnet proved a man of decided ability; was to write with applause on the Hoadley and Arian controversies; and to edit the first volume of his father's *Own Time*. He also seems to have shown a generous solicitude for the pecuniary interests of his brother William. Wodrow's informant however describes him as "loose and "rakish and in conversation not like a divine"; and Wodrow expresses a not unnatural surprise at the conduct imputed to the bishop.

His third and youngest son, Thomas, had become a yet more urgent cause of uneasiness to an anxious and Right Reverend parent. Even in his first weeks at Leyden the reports of "Thome's" behaviour had, as her diary shows, disturbed his kindly step-dame. But when he had returned, a youth of sixteen, from his three years' stay abroad, the Bishop, as we see, had been able to include him in his

generally satisfactory purview of the family virtue. A year and a half however at the Inns of Court had transformed Tom into the wild "Templar" of the early eighteenth century; whose wicked wit delighted the town; who beat the watch and insulted passengers in the ill-lighted thoroughfares of the period. Report credited these reckless spirits with association into a lawless fraternity, nicknamed from the savages of North America; and the Queen's proclamation offered £100 for the arrest of any of these "Mohocks." Rumour (rather to his gratification) included Tom Burnet in this nefarious gang; and horrified Jacobites shook their heads over the natural results of a Whig education.

For Thomas Burnet, boy as he was, had already developed into an extreme and truculent Whig. During the years 1712–13 he was credited with no less than seven anonymous pamphlets against the Ministry. In January $17\frac{12}{13}$ he was taken into custody on account of one such libel; and the Bishop was driven to intercede with the Queen for the *Nolle Prosequi*, which she granted.

Meanwhile political passion, exasperated by the long drawn peace negotiation and consequently reiterated postponement of the winter-session, rose to unexampled height. The climax was reached (November 15, 1712) in the tragic Hamilton duel, immortalized by *Esmond*, wherein fell the "Lord Arran" of Burnet's early career.

On that very day, as it chanced, Burnet signed, at Sarum, a document which caused a fresh outburst of political fury; though ostensibly only a *New Preface* to his own *Pastoral Care*.

Burnet's later prefaces (as we have already had occasion to observe) rank with the curiosities of literature. They are in fact semi-political manifestoes; in which religious exhortation and political appeals jostle one another with truly amusing vehemence. In this instance, the complaints of clerical ignorance, which excited High Church spleen, seem to have been well founded; and were in any case strictly appropriate to the theme. The defence of the good Low Churchman might even pass muster; did not Burnet dilate on the politics of that exemplary individual. His thankful acceptance (without any equivocal reservation) of the Revolution and the Hanoverian settlement; his

dread of the Pretender—whose love of Tyranny and Popery will have grown with his sufferings on their behalf—seem topics hardly relevant to the *Pastoral Care*. Nor can we trace any valid connection between clerical avocations and the terms of the impending Peace.

The Tories naturally retorted with violent invectives; of which Sewell's anonymous *Antidotum Sarisburiense*, dated Bangor, February 24, $17\frac{12}{13}$, is probably the best known.

Burnet on his part returned vigorously to the charge. He revised for publication several occasional sermons, and the *Homilies* of 1690; and to these he prefixed another of his militant *Prefaces*, which is in fact a historical defence of the Revolution. Sewell at once retorted in a second acrimonious *Letter* to the Bishop of Sarum.

In the midst of these fierce polemics—March 31, O.S., 1713—Peace was signed at Utrecht. England, the States, and France were the Powers actually concluding. It is important to remember that Portugal, the Empire—and conspicuous among the princes of the Empire, *the Elector of Hanover*—declined to concur; continuing hostilities for nearly a year longer.

Ten days later, after no less than seven prorogations, the long-delayed Session began. Burnet shared the disgust of the Whigs at the terms of Peace eventually announced. It was erroneously supposed, that the Ministry would seek a Parliamentary ratification; and in expectation of so important a debate Burnet, contrary to his wont, prepared an elaborate speech. The rumour proving false, he was loth to lose his labour, and incorporated the proposed harangue in the *History of his Own Time*. The oration thus quaintly preserved turns wholly on the point of morality; our so-called breach of fealty and "treachery" to our sworn Allies.

It is true that the final division of the Spanish dominions had much in common with a settlement favoured by William some twelve years before; that it corresponded very fairly with the salient facts of the situation, and the substantial interests of those most nearly concerned. But it is impossible to deny that England, throughout, had played no very honourable part; or that the abandonment

of Portugal and the Catalans, with the cession of Sicily to Savoy, were very discreditable conditions.

Nor would Burnet even recognize the national advantages for which we had sold our Allies. He shrewdly foretold the international complications which must spring from the Newfoundland settlement; but ignored the strategic importance of a Treaty "which may be said to "have laid the foundations of the British Empire."

Equally did he resent the terms of the Commercial Treaty. Like the rest of his generation he saw nothing to condemn in the clause which insured our predominance in the negro slave-trade; and he even joined in a protest against a relaxation of these provisions. But he shared the Protectionist views so general at the time; and the principle of Reciprocity on which the Treaty rests, tended as he feared to Free Trade between England and France. The war had of course left, as its economic heritage, the "Methuen" preference treaty with Portugal, our deserted Ally; and a silk industry artificially fostered by exclusion of French goods. But Burnet's real objections were as much political as commercial. Intercourse between the two countries was, he thought, essentially perilous. He saw the Pretender in every bale of French silks; Jesuitism and claret seemed bound in an unholy affinity. He therefore rejoiced that the Commons opposed the terms of this Treaty.

The remainder of the Session need not detain us; on July 16 the Queen prorogued, preparatory to the Dissolution which the Triennial Act required. The speech her ministers put into her mouth was a covert and sustained attack on the Whigs.

With this event, Burnet terminates the records of his own time. "I am now come" (so runs his indignant comment) "to the end of the war and of this parliament.... "[And] as this was the worst parliament I ever saw, so no "assembly but...this" could have acquiesced in such a peace. "I had," he pursues, "a noble prospect before "me, in a course of many years, of bringing [this work] to "a glorious conclusion; now the scene is so fatally altered "that I can scarce restrain myself...so here I conclude the "*History* of above three and fifty years."

His own career had but two more years to run; the details of which are somewhat obscured by the lack of autobiographical matter.

This much however is certain; to one preoccupation another instantly succeeded. Hardly was peace signed ere rumour became insistent that our sudden amity with France was but one stage in a sinister design—but intended to pave the way for a second Stuart Restoration.

The duplicity of the Ministers, in fact, reacted on themselves. The clandestine intrigues of the Peace negotiations —the brilliant and shameless dissimulation of Bolingbroke—the jealous ambiguity of Harley—seemed to hint at some dark underplot; and created an atmosphere of almost insane suspicion. The Ministry, it was known, had secret relations with Versailles; every movement of the French fleet, every rumour of a truce on the Rhine, evoked a frenzy of alarm.

These fears, it is known, went much beyond the mark. The Peace negotiations had begun with no subsidiary aims; France at this date had abandoned the cause of the Pretender; and no schemes at St James's ever reached the point of elaboration. So far we can go, and no further. For it is clear that Harley and St John, their mutual rancour notwithstanding, had each several and secret negotiations with either of the rival Courts. Both meanwhile laboured to unite in a single phalanx every sect of Tory opinion; from the pure Jacobitism of a Lockhart to the stalwart Hanoverianism of a Swift. The problem only remains which side they intended to delude; or whether either contemplated more than facing, with a powerful party in possession, the candidate fortune should favour.

The question is insoluble; for who would pin faith on the strongest asseverations of men possessing no principle of action save a purely personal ambition? That neither Harley nor St John had a tinge of Jacobite sentiment goes almost without saying. But Klopp has emphasized a fact which English writers ignore. The terms of peace had brought the Ministry—and Bolingbroke more especially—into direct conflict with the Protestant successor. Harley, as less concerned, might hope to play a double game; Bolingbroke saw no hope of power once the Elector should have succeeded. The inference is obvious.

And in justice to the Whigs we must remember that the circumstances of the case gave the Ministry peculiar influence. Neither of the rival claimants commanded the enthusiasm of the nation; and many thought any alternative preferable to a Civil War. Oxford had complete control of the pecuniary resources of the Crown, Bolingbroke of its foreign correspondence; and with the connivance of the Queen they might hope to turn the scale. Her sentiments then as now remained an enigma; we conjecture her torn to the last by conflicting terrors; and ever letting "I dare not" wait upon "I would."

All this however is by the way. There is no real need to discuss the validity of apprehensions which increased with every hour. All that actually concerns us is the belief of Burnet himself; and to him at least the Treaty with France seemed one step on a downward path. Its goal seemed a *Popish* Restoration; and the consequences of a Popish Restoration a second Marian persecution.

Under these circumstances the indefatigable old man, now verging on his seventieth year, pushed forward a project for which he had long prepared; the completion of his *History of the Reformation* by a third and final volume, devoted to the reign of Elisabeth. Early in 1713, when recovering from a fit of the gout, he engaged in friendly and animated correspondence with a learned Non-juror; the modest and amiable Mr Baker, Fellow of St John's, Cambridge. The latter had just submitted certain somewhat tardy strictures on the first two volumes; and he was much edified by the meekness with which his censures were received. In effect the old historian, while returning affectionate thanks, only begs for additional material in the interests of the impending volume.

A public advertisement, setting a date for the completion of the work, made a further appeal for all relevant papers. These and more private applications secured a liberal response; we find Burnet in communication with Strype, whom he requests to call at St John's on Tuesday, Thursday or Saturday; with Dalrymple, the Scottish antiquary, brother of the "Man of Glencoe"; even with the aged Duchess Anne of Hamilton, the friend of his early youth.

Moreover, on September 26, 1713, he dated from Salisbury, as a prelude to the anticipated publication, another of his flamboyant *Introductions*. This he proceeded to publish in pamphlet form; and it was at least once separately reprinted, ere it reappeared with the belated volume.

In this tract he dilates at length on the reasons which attract him once more to the sphere of his early labours. Fear of a Popish successor had spurred his original efforts; "if there is any difference...we are now more... "defenceless...more insensible...and much more depraved. "...All books relating to those controversies lie dead in the "shops, few calling for them." It did not apparently occur to Burnet that the work of these productions had been done, and that they no longer interested readers irrevocably estranged from Rome. Upon the horrors of the Marian persecution his turgid rhetoric dilates; the fires of Smithfield flame anew on his imaginative horizon. To the semi-infidel Tories—Bolingbroke is no doubt intended—and to the more unscrupulous members of his own clerical profession, he appeals on lower ground; self-interest should not cry in vain though piety and patriotism be dead. The ritualist he charges with secretly undermining the Church; and he deduces from recent examples the illusory character of supposed Roman reforms. A confused and half-hysterical appeal to the governing classes of the realm concludes this part of the pamphlet; and Burnet only prays he may be ready "if God calls me to it, to seal that "doctrine, which I have been preaching...above fifty years, "with my blood."

Language such as this, in its inflated vehemence, almost provokes a smile; and may be in part ascribed to a certain senile excitability. But it is very important; since it defines for us the nature and direction of Burnet's fears. To him the France of 1713 was the France of 1685; the Louis of 1713 the Louis of thirty years before; and the political mists which Ministerial tergiversation had raised were haunted by the monstrous shades of the Languedoc dragoons.

The dread, of course, appears absurdly anachronistic. To suppose that a Franco-Tory Restoration—and to

such, at the worst, can Burnet's warnings apply—would have been inaugurated by an *auto-de-fé* directed against the faith of the Tories (a faith moreover held by nineteen-twentieths of the population), is a ludicrous perversion of possibilities. The Treaty of Dover, even, was no longer "practical politics"; and by fanatical denunciation of really obsolete terrors, Burnet unconsciously did his best to discourage rational apprehension. He could be dismissed as one "party mad" who "saw Popery under every "bush."

It happened that a fire had just broken out in his study; and Parnell seized the chance for a more or less witty satire. The Bishop, he says,

> "[Still] talks and writes that Popery will return
> "And we, and he, and all his works, will burn.
> . . . . . .
> "[And], as of late he meant to bless the age
> "With flagrant *Prefaces* of party rage
> "O'erwrought with passion and the subjects' weight,
> "Lolling he nodded in his elbow seat,
> "Down fell the candle; grease and zeal conspire,
> "Heat meets with heat, and pamphlets burn their fire,
> "Here crawls a *Preface* on its half-burned maggots,
> "And there, an *Introduction* brings its faggots;
> "Then roars the prophet of the Northern Nation,
> "Scorched by a flaming speech on moderation.
> "Unwarned by this, go on the realm to fright,
> "Thou Briton, vaunting in thy second sight;
> "In such a ministry you safely tell
> "How much you'd suffer if religion fell."

Yet more scathing however is another of the many retorts evoked by Burnet's denunciations. The ferocious parody signed "Gregory Misosarum" was actually written by Swift. In the remorseless grip of the great satirist Burnet of course is as a child. His impassioned, if irrelevant, earnestness—his simple self-assertion—his utter lack of humour—afford fitting scope for the mordant irony of Jonathan; who, himself a sincere Hanoverian, resented with more than his usual *sæva indignatio* the charge of Jacobite sympathies. Brilliant is the Dean's explanation of his lordship's lacrymose forebodings. He has, suggests Swift gravely, "been poring so long over Foxe's *Book of*

"*Martyrs* that he imagines himself living in the reign of "Queen Mary."

Yet this satire, which reached a second edition, is repulsive even to Swift's greatest admirers; among whom the present writer is proud to rank. Burnet had early recognised the splendid genius of Swift: in the days when the latter had been as nearly a Whig as professional arrogance allowed, they had even been friends. Yet this attack is in Swift's most unscrupulous vein; and the appreciative Scott rightly resents the "harsh and "disrespectful" insults hurled against "the venerable "champion." We may hope that a dark allusion to sacrilege is not really intended to endorse the scurrilities of Mrs Manley. But the sneering contrast between the Bishop's wealth, and the poverty of the inferior clergy—the direct assertion that he grudged them the Bounty of Queen Anne, are flagrant specimens of deliberately insolent injustice.

Swift, in fact, himself, like the very man he satirized, was heated almost to intoxication by political passion. For as the autumn of 1713 passed into winter the Queen's failing health showed the crisis to be near at hand. A general election intensified party virulence; and the contests were fought with unexampled ferocity. Ribald, if amusing, verses by the graceless Tom, who of course took the thick of the fray, describes a political drinking bout in which

> "We drank to the Bishop, old Gilbert of Sarum
> "The Tories he'll baffle, in pulpit ne'er spare 'em
> "And show the blind geese that their sense is but *parum*."

This hopeful scion of the Episcopal house next engaged in a violent altercation with one of the Wiltshire Penruddocks. A duel was only averted by the drastic promptitude of the Bishop; who, regarding every duel as an attempted murder, locked the door on his obstreperous son.

Meanwhile Tory rancour was no whit behind Whig insolence. It was probably at this time that a London Rector, of pronounced Jacobite sympathies, ordered Burnet's likeness under the character of Judas to be embodied in the altar-piece of his church. From this profane insult the

remembrance of his Parliamentary privilege alone saved him; his friend White Kennett was portrayed in his stead; and the picture had to be removed by order of the Bishop of London.

As the result of this truculent electoral struggle the Tories remained in power with a slightly reduced majority. From this time forth the Queen's health rapidly declined; more than once during January she seemed at death's door; on February 16, 1714, she was unable to open Parliament; and when, on March 2, she made her speech at St Stephen's, it was evident that the end could not be long delayed.

The issue none dared predict. Her speech appeared strongly Hanoverian in tone; but her real hopes, and the true aims of her ministry, remained as dubious as ever. Meanwhile, peace between the Empire and France left, as it seemed, the latter free to act. The avowed Jacobites evinced unusual activity, boasting openly of Ministerial sympathy and of French support.

At this dramatic moment Burnet's apprehensions reached their climax. On March 29—Easter Monday—he preached at the church of St Bride. Its fine steeple, so nobly recessed at the entrance of Fleet Street, was then scarce thirty years old; and had received but three years before its famous peal of bells. It was the occasion of the annual "Spittal" (or Hospital) Sermon for the benefit of the London charities; to Burnet a familiar and a congenial function. This year, however, the list of the year's benefactions, the eulogy of discriminate almsgiving, the commendation of elementary teaching as the most fruitful form of kindness, occupy a subordinate place. The political situation alone claims heart and mind and tongue. The sins of the nation crowd on the preacher's remembrance; a profanity almost universal—satiric cruelty at its height—the pamphlet war, whereof the ink "may soon turn to blood"—and party spirit "our plague as well as sin." And from Sin he passes to Punishments; to the Judgments which God has in reserve. Calamity hangs suspended by a single frail thread; the thread of a "sacred life" which our foes—the Jacobites—may yet prematurely sever. But his hearers, he opines, can hardly realise the issue. England has felt the pressure of war; she has not tasted its horrors. The

miseries which have wasted Europe he paints in lurid hues; too soon it may be ours to endure them—at the hand of an invader. Our shores lie defenceless; our noble commanders we have spurned; disbanded soldiers starve in highway and byway; the "Mighty States" our allies are abused by the pen-men of our rulers. Smoke from the fires of Smithfield dims anew his prophetic sight; he cries as a watchman from his tower; Repentance, Charity, Justice, may yet avert the Doom.

To those who actually heard, this outburst must have been strangely impressive; a prophet, as of the Hebrews, appeals to the age of Anne. The absent of course ridiculed his fervent vaticinations; and Sewell, more particularly, sneered in his usual brilliant vein. Burnet is the Quixote of the day; and with Blood, Fire, Popery, on the brain tilts on at political windmills.

At St Stephen's meanwhile the rage of conflict increased; and the Ministry slowly lost ground. Its subservience to the Jacobite Tories strained the loyalty of the Hanoverian wing; doubts as to its sincerity paralyzed many more; while the party was rent by the rivalry between Harley and St John. On April 5 a large number of Hanoverian Tories and a majority of the Bishops supported Wharton's motion that the Protestant succession is in danger. This motion was not, however, actually carried. Burnet seems to have been silent. Yet he spoke the same day to a rather empty house in favour of the resolution, which urged further endeavours to drive the "Pretender" from Bar-le-Duc; prayed for an Imperial guarantee of the Protestant succession; and urged that a price should be set, from the moment of his landing, on the head of the "Pretender." Burnet was supported by London and Bristol; the motion passed; and the Government next day barely carried a mitigated amendment, which respected the scruples of the Queen.

On April 14 the Upper House, once more, discussed the terms of the Peace. Burnet reiterated his view, that no ally is justified in deserting his friends till he has warned them of having reached his *ultimus conatus* and is threatened with *certa pernicies*. He denied that we had done the first; and argued that persistence would have involved the second —to our foe. This the Bishop of London, as one of the

Plenipotentiaries, emphatically contested; while Wharton, on the other hand, suggested that the Ministry's effort to obtain the ratification of its action, was its own *ultimus conatus*, threatening it with *certa pernicies*. "Good my lords," he cried, "gratify my curiosity to...see...a *certa pernicies*." By 13 votes only the Government won the day.

Meanwhile Convocation was actually doing some work; though distracted by disputes concerning the celebrated Dr Clarke, an Arian or semi-Arian, less extreme than Whiston and very much less bold. A cautiously worded letter of submission pacified the Upper House; Burnet declaring vehemently in Clarke's favour. Adversaries reported that the "oldest and modestest" of Burnet's sons (all of whom were intimate with Dr Clarke) identified the Doctor's tenets and those of his father. This can only mean that the Bishop concurred with the *terms of Clarke's submission*, which was strictly orthodox in style. Others report the Bishop as asseverating "he would have been burnt alive" ere he would have ranked among the original signatories to the Nicene Creed. This again can only connote his dislike of theologic refinements, and his abiding regret at the schism to which that creed had conduced. Less easy to explain is his rude insolence to the Bishop of London; whom he accused of favouring Clarke's deprivation, that he might present to his valuable living. This flower of debate evoked a general resentment; and only an equality of votes saved Burnet from public apology.

But even topics so exciting, so acute a national crisis, could not detain Burnet from the scene of his episcopal duties. By May 28 he had left London for Sarum. He was thus absent from the House of Lords when the discreditable "Schism Act," which forbade Dissenters, on pain of imprisonment, to engage in the work of teaching, was rushed by Bolingbroke through both Houses of Parliament[1].

The motive of Burnet's journey was his triennial visitation, which he approached this year with feelings of peculiar solemnity. He had now over-passed his three-score years and ten; and was possessed by a presentiment—a presentiment actually fulfilled—that he was about for the last time to meet his assembled clergy.

[1] After consultation with Atterbury but in Harley's despite.

A pathetic import thus attaches to this, his final charge. Five and twenty years—as he reminds his hearers—have elapsed since his first visitation. The age he has attained, and some "other circumstances" warn him of his final account; and he selects for his theme Paul's farewell to the Ephesians. From the ideal of the Pastoral Care, conveyed in the Apostolic address, he turns to the courage which, under a foreboding of "affliction and bonds" led Paul back to Jerusalem. "And now" (continues Burnet) "...let us... "ask ourselves, what emotion do we feel...upon the present "prospect of danger, with which both friends and enemies "seem...so much possessed? Do our minds sink within "us?...If we are the true disciples of Christ we will rather "lift up our heads...because our redemption draws near. "We may indeed tremble for the ark of God....We may "lawfully pray that this cup...pass from us. But when it "appears...the will of God to put it in our hands shall we "not drink it?...We know we must all die once, and can "we ever die so gloriously and hope to do so much good... "by our death, as if we should die for Him who loved us, "and has washed us...in His own blood?" As regards Popery, Burnet distinguishes between the system and the individuals. For many among the latter he has "personal "charity...I have known and have particularly loved many "good men among them. But I can never enough express "my abhorrence of the spirit that prevails among them, of "the corruptions of their worship, of the monstrous abuse "of Confession and Absolution, of the detestable venality "of all things at Rome, and of the intolerable tyranny of "that Court." With a rather perfunctory warning against "the profane tribe...who call themselves free thinkers," and a last earnest appeal for pastoral energy, the charge concludes.

An accompanying sermon reverts to the theme of persecution. No strength of their own, no merely external zeal, can, he warns his hearers, support in the day of trial. The faith which alone truly transforms the man—the state of final fruition for which they that suffer long,—are painted for those that listen in noble pathetic terms.

Apprehensions, however extreme, which are met in so lofty a spirit, deserve at least our respect. The visitation

over, Burnet, as his text had foreboded, returned at once to the post of apparent danger; and by June 25 was conducting an ordination in London and once more in the House of Lords.

During his absence, the plot had thickened. The sudden death of the aged Electress—due it is said to an angry letter dictated by Bolingbroke to the Queen—had still further obscured the issue; for her succession was rather more desired than was that of her son. Harley, on the other hand, had at last forced the Queen to set a price on the Pretender's head.

The crisis rapidly approached. Though the Queen on July 9, in true Stuart style, warded off an attack of Bolingbroke by a sudden prorogation, it was known that her strength was failing; and fierce contentions among her ministers probably hastened her end. When on July 27, Bolingbroke ousted Harley, it was only to hold the reins for forty-eight hours; on the morning of July 29 the Queen became suddenly unconscious. Whatever Bolingbroke's schemes, he had no time to act; and when the Hanoverians stormed the Cabinet Council, Bolingbroke at once capitulated. Fear of a civil war brought the rest of the Ministry to heel; and into Shrewsbury's hand, at the Cabinet's unanimous request, the dying Queen pressed the coveted Treasurer's staff. The vacillating Shrewsbury at length knows his own mind; and steps are promptly taken for the early proclamation of "King George."

Though the fact that the Queen lay *in extremis* was suppressed as far as possible, Burnet at Clerkenwell had of course first-hand information. Very early on the morning of Sunday, August 1, he started for Kensington Palace, where the dying Queen lay. As his coach entered Smithfield he noticed his friend Mr Bradbury, the well-known Independent preacher, in a very pensive mood. Burnet asked the reason. It was the day on which the Schism Act should have come into operation; Mr Bradbury, amid appropriate surroundings, reflected on the prospect of Martyrdom. Burnet reported the Queen as at the last gasp, himself as on the way to enquire; and promised instant news of the event. Should his messenger find divine service in progress Bradbury would receive intimation through a concerted signal.

Ere Burnet reached the Palace all must have been over. Between seven and eight that morning the Queen had passed away; and orders had instantly issued to proclaim the Protestant successor. Burnet fulfilled his promise. The emissary found Bradbury in the pulpit, and as previously settled, dropped a handkerchief from the gallery. Bradbury accordingly concluded his sermon with fervent thanksgiving; announced to his startled hearers the accession of King George; and led his congregation in a final psalm of triumph.

What Burnet himself felt is not left for conjecture. By September 18 (on which day Burnet, at St Mary-le-Bow, performed his last ordination) the new King had arrived in England; on October 20 he was crowned. Ten days later the Bishop of Sarum preached "before his Majesty King "George at his Royal Chapel of St James's."

The sermon (ostensibly on Ps. ii. 10–11) is really a retrospect of the great historic crises through which the Reformation had passed. The recent climax is unreservedly cited; "we saw a sacred life declining every year; we "heard from all quarters the...insultings of our enemies; "they seemed assured of a cheap and easy conquest....The "best men among us were preparing themselves, for all "the dismal effects [of] such a scene of confusion, but it "pleased God to...dissipate our fears all at once."

The personal virtues of "our late gracious Queen... "whom in a course of many years I had the honour to "know so particularly," are appreciatively recalled; "in "these," says Burnet, "she was a great example." On more public topics he remains discreetly silent; "I presume "not to speak of those things into the secret of which "I was never called." A eulogy of True Religion—regret that the "infidelity of some" zealous "for our constitution "in...civil concerns" had permitted the enemy to blaspheme —lead Burnet to the conclusion of his last published sermon.

A few letters—a few trivial anecdotes—and we reach the final scene. A deputation from the Kirk (as the garrulous Wodrow reminds us) congratulated the new King. Its members waited on the Bishop, and were edified by the fervour with which he praised a religious treatise, written in the days of his own youth by William

Guthrie the Protestor, and dear to the peasantry of Scotland as "The Christian's Great Interest." He had had it recently republished for the use of his diocese; and a "gilded copy" of this edition was presented to each member of the deputation.

No less edified were the Scottish Lords who supped with him one Sunday night, and heard the lecture which followed. It reminded them of Scottish custom; and they contrasted it favourably with the Cathedral service of the morning. "My lord," answered the Bishop, "both those "of the Low Church and High Church do own there are "several things in our Liturgy and worship which need to "be helped; and I have just now by me" (among the materials for his forthcoming history) "an autograph copy "of letters betwixt our first reformers Cranmer and others, "and the Ministers of Zurich and other learned persons "abroad, which will shew how very much those good men "desired a reformation in many things that the Dissenters "seek. The worthy men that followed them, and those "great men that were immediately before us, and many of "us desire" the same.—"Why, then," said the other, "is "not this desirable work done...?" "The reason is plain," said the Bishop, "we are broken and divided among our-"selves; and the High Church would have the Dissenters "ruined, and we of the Low Church would have them "gained! and there it stands."

But if abortive longings for ecclesiastical reunion and ecclesiastical revival still vexed the aged prelate, politically speaking all his aspirations were fulfilled. The Succession secured, the Toleration intact, but one feature of the prospect can have vexed his generous soul.

His son Thomas presumably possessed some humour. It was he who, when caught by the Bishop in a mood unusually pensive, foreshadowed a work yet greater than his father's *Reformation*—namely, *his own.* His political squibs, however, are coarse rather than witty; and they were succeeded, October 16, 1714, by a bloodthirsty diatribe on the *Necessity of Impeaching the late Ministry.* It reached a second edition, and evoked the bitter comments of Harley himself.

The old prelate had strongly disapproved his son's

political escapades. He had refused to introduce him to Halifax; and "told me," writes Tom, "I was to expect "nothing but [by] my own industry in the law." How different was his own attitude is touchingly displayed.

In January, 1715, with a dedication to the new King, appeared the long promised third volume of his *Reformation*. The presentation copy which he sent to Mr Baker was "covered" by an affectionate letter. "I do not deny," he continues, "that I thought a late volume [against taking "the oaths to King George] was written by some in St "John's College; since some there, as they had much leisure, "so were very capable of composing that work, that was "written with a great deal of gravity and decency. I "never think the worse of men for their different sentiments "in such matters; I am sure I am bound to think much "the better of them for adhering firmly to the dictates of "their conscience, when it is so much to their loss, and "when so sacred a thing as an oath is in the case. I wish "all who had the same persuasions had acted with the same "strictness and tenderness. But I have such a regard both "for yourself and your friends, that as I am extreme sorry "that the Church has so long lost the service of such worthy "men, so I am very glad to have it in my power, from what "you are pleased to write to me, to vindicate both you and "them in that particular. For I am with a true and high "esteem," etc., etc.

Mr Baker, in his letter of thanks, must have deprecated the office of critic, and urged the pitiable case of Mr Hilkiah Bedford. This energetic Non-juror, the partner of Hickes in his attacks on Burnet, had been sentenced twelve months earlier, for his share in a Jacobite pamphlet, to three years' imprisonment.

To this appeal Burnet responded under date London, 8th February [1715], "You give thanks for a trifle, when "much was due [to you], but I cannot help thinking that "I discern through all the civility of your obliging expres- "sions that you may find matter for correction; your very "excusing yourself so earnestly from it, looks as if you saw "some matter for it, though your modesty restrains you. "I will therefore take the liberty to charge you, by your "love of truth, to use all due freedom with me, with

"relation to this volume; by which you will lay a new and a "very singular obligation on [me]....When things are come "to a more quiet state I promise you I will do what I "can to deliver Mr Bedford out of his trouble; and in the "meantime will contribute to his support."

This simple and affecting letter contains the last record which Gilbert Burnet has left us. We do not wonder at the permanent impression made on the mind of Mr Baker, by this legacy from one who has been vituperated as compact of vanity and party spite. It verifies the graceful tribute contained in the "Halifax" portrait; which describes Burnet as "not quicker in discerning other men's "faults than...in forgiving them; so ready, or rather glad "to acknowledge his own, that from blemishes they become "ornaments. All the repeated provocations of his indecent "adversaries" (pursues the *Character*) "have had no other "effect than the setting his good nature in so much a "better light; since his anger never yet went farther than "to pity them. That heat which in most other men raises "sharpness and satire, in him glows into warmth for his "friends, and compassion for those in want and misery."

The end was now close at hand. Early in the following month Burnet contracted a chill. It speedily developed into "a pleuritic fever," and despite the "care and skill" of his "friend and relation" Dr Cheyne (who called into consultation Dr Mead and Sir Hans Sloane), the case became speedily "desperate." His character, wrote his son years afterwards, "was too well known to induce any "one to conceal from him the danger his life was in; he "bore the notice...with...calm resignation to Providence; "...and...was so little sensible of the terrors of death as to "embrace its approach with joy....As he preserved his "senses to the last, so he employed the...remnant of life in "continued acts of devotion, and in giving the best advice to "his family, of whom he took leave [with] the utmost tender- "ness [and] the firmest constancy of mind; ...[though] he "could not but express a concern for the grief" he saw around. After only three days illness, on March 17, 1715 —the very day on which the Hanoverian King met his first Parliament—Gilbert Burnet passed away; "in the "calmest and most silent [manner], without a sigh or groan;

"but fetching one long breath on a sudden [he] ceased "to breathe."

Even the graceless Tom was sensibly affected by the loss of the "best of fathers." To the son's political ardour he seemed another Moses, who had but seen, without entering, the long-sought Promised Land. Yet, as the son admits, he died in good time for his fame. His powers had just lasted till the completion of his great work; they could not have survived so severe a seizure. Politically, too, he was happy in the moment of his death. He saw neither the proscription of the Tories nor the rising of "1715."

They buried him in the parish church (scarce a stone's throw from St John's); for such was his wish should he die away from Sarum. Party passion ran high; the cavalcade was stoned by a Tory-Jacobite mob. Tory writers count this to Burnet's discredit—rather it would seem a discredit to the mob. The church has been rebuilt; and in rebuilding Burnet's coffin was opened. A stone beneath the Communion Table still marks its resting place; and his tablet, erected by the parishioners, still hangs in the porch outside.

The virulent pasquinades which pursued his memory are described in a note. They are ribald enough. But one attributed to Arbuthnot is remarkably witty; and parodies very vividly the weaknesses of the man.

Burnet's will, dated October 24, 1711, seems to have had the rare fortune of pleasing all concerned. The exordium, after the fashion of the time, commends his soul to the Creator, through the merits of Christ. "A true "Protestant according to the Church of England," he professes charity for foreign Protestants and English Dissenters. With these he would gladly co-operate to oppose Atheism, Infidelity, and, above all, Popery, "the "greatest enemy to our Church, more to be dreaded than "all other parties whatsoever." His library and other effects (specific bequests excepted) were to be sold for the benefit of his children; his entire estate (specific bequests again excepted, but all settled sums included) falling into six shares, of which two were devised to his eldest son, and one each to his four younger children. A codicil assigned

certain chattels severally among his children; and the list contained some interesting items. To each he bequeathed one of his Bibles. His eldest son inherited, together with some plate and furniture, "all my works bound in red "Turkey leather, my mathematical instruments, wind- "pump, and glasses," and after Secretary Johnston's death, the reversion of "my picture by Sir Godfrey Kneller[1];" while to Thomas, *inter alia*, fell *The Scottish Black Arts*. Handsome legacies to his own University of Aberdeen and to the parish of Saltoun have been mentioned in Part I; they amounted to £2222 3*s*. 6*d*. sterling. To his successor at Salisbury (following a former precedent) Burnet left the furniture of the chapel and of "the great upper room" in the palace. Salisbury town only profited to the extent of £20 to the poor and six months salary in advance to the Master of the Charity school. Each servant in his employ received six months wages.

His son William was appointed executor; but a codicil assigned the Bishop's papers to Gilbert (who had actually taken orders) for his sole use; excepting the manuscript *Essays and Meditations on Morality and Religion*, to be printed when Gilbert pleased[2]; and the *History of his Own Time* (with its autobiographical appendix) which was not to see the light within six years, but was eventually to be published *verbatim* from the Bishop's final text. The immediate publication of the will, with the above codicil, attracted general attention; and when in 1724 Gilbert Burnet duly issued the first (pre-Revolution) volume, its contents for some time monopolised public conversation. It was a veritable *succès de scandale*.

Ten years later (Gilbert having died in the interval) Thomas, then a rising barrister on his way to the judicial bench, edited the second volume. Neither instalment appeared as the author had left it; and on the plea that the garrulous autobiographical appendix extended but to 1710, Thomas substituted in its place a staid conventional biography. This subject however has been treated at length elsewhere.

[1] This picture had been painted in 1689, at the instance of John Evelyn. See his *Diary*, June 9 of that year.

[2] This manuscript was never published and seems to have completely disappeared.

And what of the man himself, whose career we have followed to its close? The brilliant pen-portraits of a Macaulay, a Von Ranke, a Lecky, lie before us; is it for us to enter into competition?

The question must rise; it must be as resolutely repressed; for to shrink, on such a plea, from an estimate of his character would be pure pusillanimity. The familiarity which comes with the investigation of years must be able to supplement even the intuitions of genius.

At the outset we must admit the plausibility of a sinister interpretation. From a bald outline of his career has been deduced the hypocritical adventurer, his principles swayed by his passions, his changes of opinion coincident with the turns of his fortune. If we reject this reading *in toto*, we do so largely on the strength of those artless autobiographical confidences, which his posterity dismissed as too indiscreet for publication. It is these, after all, that really reveal the man.

Stress must then first be laid on the abounding vitality of the man we have to portray. In him the sound health, the broad intelligence, the humane and equable geniality distinctive of the Burnet stock, fused with the nervous intensity, the fierce but narrow force, which a wild Border ancestry gave to his merchant kin. Hence that overwhelming vigour which lent the exaggeration of superabundant energy to the hopes, the fears, the friendships, the prejudices of sixty strenuous years. There was always something essentially lavish about Gilbert Burnet. Prodigal of his time, prodigal of his labour, prodigal of his bounty—prodigal even of his forgiveness—his virile and versatile energy (as was said of a later prelate) "could not be bounded [by] the "limits of a diocese but must embrace the whole nation in "its cares[1]."

For his interests were as broad as they were fervent. "Mobile and sympathetic" as was ever Samuel Wilberforce, like him "a keen and varied reader" and by consequence always ready, no one (too) could have "fastened with [more] eagerness, or greater acuteness of "perception, upon every means of information which either "books or men supplied[2]." As a thinker, he lacked initiative;

[1] See *Life of Wilberforce*, III. 436.

[2] *Ibid.* I. xv. 53.

he had (in his own words) "more compass than depth"; he cannot rank with the intellectual giants who enlarge the horizon of thought. But if not originative, he was in his way original. A vigorous, an honest, an independent thinker, he had absorbed and to some extent fused, in a variety of departments, the best energies of his time. The art of oratory he had studied under the great French preachers of the day. In theology Leighton was his Master; his science he learned at the feet of Boyle and Wilkins; his father gave him insight into the broad principles of law; Stillingfleet taught him something of his own scholarly ideals; in history he continued the tradition of Thuanus and Father Paul. The politics which he had inherited from the Royalist left-wing (tempered in his father's case by the influence of Grotius), underwent a gradual development in the school of practical experience. And his religion, his politics and his law, his science and his history, his scholarship and his oratorical instincts, reacted one upon another; saving him from the narrowness of outlook which is the special curse of the expert. The most moving rhetorician of his day, no one ever erred less by sacrificing sense to sound. Passionately religious, he lacked the exclusive fanaticism of the devotee. A keen politician, he saw beyond the shibboleths of party. A cleric of the clerics, he had no parsonical pettiness. Nothing human was ever alien to Burnet, and he brought to the study, even of the past, the vivid interest which most reserve for the present.

It was to this union of vigour and breadth that he owed his robust common sense. He had not the judicial instinct; nor, though a shrewd observer, do his writings display profound insight into character. But he saw, in certain respects truer than most men, because his field of vision was wider; because his attention was not riveted to a single aspect of events.

And his vigour was as perennial as it was boundless. Age could not stale nor custom wither the inexhaustible fervour which kept him ever young. His enthusiasm survived, in almost boyish extravagance, the storm and stress of three-score crowded years. He retained to the last the mental acquisitiveness, the eager sympathies, the

facile hero-worship which are the happy privilege of the young.

But this opulent nature had the defects of its qualities. What it gained in breadth and vigour, it lost in delicacy. Gentle by birth and breeding, with the "long pedigree" valued in the North, he was strangely lacking in the instincts which should mark the gentleman. Rather, he strikes one as essentially "the burgher." There is about him an occasional obtuseness of perception which more than verges on the coarse; a frequent insensibility to the finer issues of morals, of manners, of intellectuals, of action, and of style. Taste, it has been said is the sense of the appropriate, and tact of the opportune; in both was Gilbert Burnet lamentably deficient.

And with the energies of youth he retained something of its weakness. His was the innocent vanity that loves to feel itself "important"; the childish self-complacency, the child-like self-reproach appropriate to the age that knows no reason for reserve; the passion for persistent interrogation only pardonable on the threshold of life; the terrible candour which should remain the embarrassing prerogative of childhood. With all his native generosity he can bear a childish grudge; and like a sulky playmate, can descend to "calling names." Bold with the rash impetuosity of boyhood, he could blench at a sudden trial; take too often for truth the "bogies" of his own imagination; evade, with childish prevarication, a charge essentially just.

If we touch in turn on the various aspects of his activity we notice how much his *literary* work reflects the characteristics of the man. It is the product of an intellect capacious, vigorous and robust, rather than of one subtle or profound. Yet its strong vitality, its insistence on the perennial interests of life and thought gives his work a permanent value. It is this which has survived the cavils of pedantry, and can dispense with the antiseptic of style[1].

[1] The copious facility of his work is the aspect most vividly presented in the celebrated "Halifax" portrait. "Dr Burnet," says our author, "...like all men who "are above the ordinary level [is] seldom spoken of in a mean—he must either "be railed at or admired; he has a swiftness of imagination that no other man "comes up to; and as our nature hardly allows us to have enough of anything "without having too much, he cannot at all times so hold in his thoughts but "that at some time they may run away with him, as it is hard for a vessel that "is brimful, when in motion, not to run over; and therefore the variety of matter "that he ever carries about him may throw out more than an unkind critic

In the *political* field we are struck by the passion, the sincerity, the breadth of Burnet's patriotism. It was the expression of what, for want of a better term, we have called his political Erastianism; and yet so tepid a term belies the half-mystical ardour which, for him, transformed the Grotian theory of the State. To him "the Divine Right "of government" (to borrow Disraeli's aphorism) was indeed the "keystone of human progress; without which "law sinks into police and a nation is degraded into a "mob." For him, as for Milton, his country had all the sacredness which Jerusalem bore for the Jew; and the political claims which High Church fanatics (Presbyterian, Episcopal or Popish) advanced for the ecclesiastical organization seemed to him a flagrant usurpation on rights as sacred as its own. This "religious secularism" (if one may coin such a term), which far from denouncing religion resents the restriction of its scope—which far from profaning the temple lends equal sanctity to the forum—had been, since the days of Wickliffe, conspicuous in English life. It was the quality which enabled Burnet to sympathize in some respects with the English Reformation and English institutions as he could not sympathize with the more strictly ecclesiastical trend of the Scottish Reformation, and of the institutions to which it gave birth.

In his earlier days this patriotic enthusiasm had centred on the National *Executive*. Disgusted by the ecclesiastical

"would allow of. His first thoughts may sometimes require more digestion, "not from a defect in his judgment, but from the abundance of his fancy, which "furnishes too fast for him. His friends love him too well to see small faults; "or, if they do, think that his greater talents give him a privilege of straying "from the strict rules of caution, and exempt him from the ordinary rules of "censure. He produces so fast that what is well in his writings calls for "admiration, and what is incorrect deserves an excuse; he may, in some "things, require grains of allowance, which those only can deny him who "are unknown or unjust to him. . . . . .
"As dull men have quick eyes in discerning the smaller faults of those that "Nature has made superior to them, they do not miss one blot he makes; and, "being beholden only to their barrenness for their discretion, they fall upon the "errors which arise out of his abundance; and by a mistake into which their "malice betrays them, they think that by finding a mote in his eye, they hide "the beams that are in their own. His quickness makes writing so easy a thing "to him that his spirits are neither wasted nor soured by it. The soil is not "forced; everything grows and brings forth without pangs, which distinguishes "as much what he does from that which smells of the lamp as a good palate "will discern between fruit which comes from a rich mould and that which "tastes of the uncleanly pains that have been bestowed upon it."

faction fights, the ecclesiastical tyranny of his boyhood, he saw the Nation embodied the person of the Magistrate; since only the iron hand of Cromwell, or the prerogatives of a restored king, had intervened between these isles and ruin. Yet if he used at first language almost reminiscent of a Hobbes—if the doctrine of passive obedience was ever on his lips—what drew him was the germ within, which leads from Hobbes to Locke. The King for Burnet is no mere capricious autocrat—he represents rather the supreme sanctity of the State; but if so, he can only remain supreme so long as he remains representative. Once admit that the Body Politic, the "Leviathan," must, *politically* speaking, transcend corporations and individuals, a further problem soon arises; does any individual Magistrate—can any individual Magistrate—adequately represent this Body? Thus Burnet gradually comes to recognize *Legislature* rather than Executive as the true representative of the State. The two come into collision; and Burnet admits that "in opposition to the ecclesiastical tyranny" he has carried "the power of the Civil Magistrate too high."

And if eventually a single Parliamentary party, in its zeal for what seemed to him our interests, becomes for him the true symbol of the Nation, the spirit remains still the same. King, Parliament, Party, whatever his enthusiasm for either, are to him but means to an end; the Independence, the Honour, the True Welfare of the Embodied Nation.

It is indeed the irony of fate, which, on the strength of half-a-dozen years during which party passion ran mad, brings Burnet down to posterity in the character of a rabid party-man. For his intellect, his sympathies, his principles—everything perhaps but his temper—were the reverse of partizan. During most of his life, metaphorically speaking, he sat on the "cross-benches"; and his sympathies could be confined to no faction or sect. He was emphatically the cautious and conservative reformer which later ages dubbed a "Whig of the Revolution"; meaning not the fanatic whom the Revolution called a Whig, but a representative of the coalition and the compromise which made the Revolution possible.

And his patriotism was as broad as it was sane. Devoted in his attachment to the land of his nativity—

with all the *perfervidum ingenium* and educational zeal which so honourably mark the Scot—none was ever more loyal to the welfare of Scotland; more eager in offices of friendship to his immediate countrymen; more touchingly faithful to the friends, the memories of his youth. Yet no man less shared the petty jealousies, the restricted outlook which too often disfigured the Scotchman of his own day. His career in fact prefigured the results of that Union which he did so much to further; the patriotism of the Scot, without loss of its local intensity, set as it were and clasped in the enfolding patriotism of the Briton.

Nor was even his British patriotism of the narrow aggressive type. One of the few Britons of his time who could boast a European reputation, his interests were not confined to these islands, or even to the "Plantations" and dependencies whose welfare he so eagerly sought. His knowledge of foreign politics was extensive if not profound; foreign relations employed his thoughts as much as did internal politics; and the welfare of foreign nations was only less to him than our own. Even the secular strife against France, in which he was so passionately concerned, seemed to him merely directed against the dangerous ambition of its ruler. Few admired more the noble nation which Louis XIV had rendered a menace to Europe.

His patriotism, of course, was not always "according to "knowledge." Excellent as were his aims, broad as were his views, he had not the instincts of the statesman, the level judgment which should mark the man of affairs; and to misguided patriotic fervour, animated now and again by the spur of personal feeling, we must ascribe many of the errors of a life in which errors abound. Ill-balanced patriotic apprehension dictated the "Case of Barrenness," inspired Burnet's animus against Sir John Fenwick, embittered the anti-Roman acrimony which marred his later years. In the interests of the State, though not of the Church, he could further a policy which hardly differs from persecution.

For it should be noted—the fact is remarkably significant—that Burnet at no time advocated *religious* repression[1], or condoned the infliction of hardship by one Confession

[1] The passages on pp. 347–8 only relate to blasphemy in the legal sense.

on another. His preface to the *De Mortibus Persecutorum* lays down with absolute plainness the teaching of Christ on this head; and he had even the candour to complain, that despite the fierce precepts of their faith, the Moslems of his own day showed more practical tolerance than many a Christian zealot. But Burnet explicitly and repeatedly allowed to the *State* the right of prescribing the terms on which public office, and even the right of domicile, shall depend. As repeatedly and explicitly he has laid down that religious doctrines subversive of the foundations of the State are sufficient cause for the State's refusal of either. The doctrines of Rome, so he held in later years, subvert the Erastian foundations of the English Commonwealth; and he therefore applauded not only the exclusion of Roman Catholics from office (with the corresponding exclusion of Dissenters, for which practical considerations called), but also measures calculated to drive the Papists into exile. He forgot that the worst persecutions which the primitive Christians endured were Civil and not Religious in their origin.

Yet with all reservation made for his faults and his follies, Burnet's patriotism is of a higher type than was usual in his age. Indeed, his own enthusiastic sincerity blinded him to the perfidy so general around him. The double-distilled treachery of a Godolphin and a Marlborough—of an Orford and a Shrewsbury—were really beneath his conception, as well as beyond his ken.

Lastly, we turn to consider the character of his personal religion—the supreme interest, as Burnet justly calls it, of his own long career. Though skilled in doctrinal controversy, he cared less for the metaphysics of religion than for its moral and emotional aspects. The moral consequence of dogma was for him its final test; the moral aspect of history is that which allures him; the function of a preacher of righteousness is that which he most desires. To the last he retained, when farthest from Puritan scrupulosity, an immense respect for the essence of Puritan morals; for that tempered asceticism which, while respecting the bases of family and national life, touches with a bracing austerity political and social existence.

Yet he had nothing in common with the pure moralist,

utilitarian or secular. His morality was more than "touched "with emotion"; it was based on religious postulates, fenced by religious sanctions, inspired by religious hopes. If speculation did not allure him it was because, like most men of practical and sanguine temperament, he never seriously questioned his own fundamental beliefs. For him a Scripture, essentially though not verbally inspired, had revealed, and for ever, the foundations on which action must depend. His theology, if broad in its details, was conservatively orthodox in essentials; and the Primitive in doctrine, if not in practice, seemed for him essentially the true.

This conception defined for him the function of the Christian Church. In his eyes it was no political organism, but the incorporate symbol of the Religious Consciousness in Man rising to the recognition of a Covenant between the Human and Divine. It thus first reached its true form as it symbolized the religious consciousness of a nation; the Christianized State being for him the true image of the *Patria Celestis*—the ultimate "City of God." That the nation might become apostate he very readily conceded; but this appeared to him the sole justification for religious Dissent. Ritual preferences, differing from those of the national majority, the conviction even that the ecclesiastical forms approved by the majority was of inferior authority or worth, seem to him pretexts insufficient for breach of National Communion.

The function of the Pastoral Care he considered the highest on earth. To him the Christian Ministry in its ideal form was at once the witness to divine mysteries—the embodied Conscience of the Nation. In it he found his own true avocation; for he was not, like Swift or Atterbury, a politician spoiled. Nor did he need like them, in the interests of a personal arrogance, to buttress the external dignity of a profession unhappily chosen. Rather his belief in the loftiness of the career he had adopted rendered him a doubly unsparing censor of every clerical abuse.

His purely devotional work—apart from certain of his sermons—is best resumed in his appendix to Scougall's tract. This, it is said, worked the "conversion" of one

among the Methodist apostles; while the fine tributes of Jebb and Alexander Knox show his influence over those precursors of the "Oxford" school. His teaching, which of course betrays the influence of Leighton, combines broad common-sense with an almost mystical ardour; and no primitive enthusiast—no monk of the Middle Ages—no saint of the evangelical, Oxford, or Cambridge "move-"ments" has expressed with greater fervour the desire for vision of the Divine.

His own words shall complete the tale of his career. "I have, considering my sphere, seen a great deal of all "that is most shining and tempting....I was for...years "deeply immersed [in intrigues of State], but still with hopes "of reforming the world....I acquainted myself with know-"ledge and learning, and that in a great variety....I have... "cultivated friendship with much zeal, and a disinterested "tenderness....But...upon great and long experience, I "could enlarge on the preacher's text, Vanity of vanities...! "[and] also conclude with him....

"I do therefore end all in the words of David...The "righteous cry and the Lord heareth....The Lord is nigh "unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such "as are of a contrite spirit."

With these words,—in which a singer of our day resumed Sixty Years of a later Queen's career,—the historian sums up the *History of His Own Time*.

APPENDIX I.

NOTES.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE LINE

3 2 The name is variously spelt—Burnard, Burnet, Burnett. The last form has been adopted by the family of Leys since the middle of the 17th century. (See *Family of Burnett*, New Spalding Club.)

,, 8 *Family of Burnett*, *App.* p. 154.

,, 26 *Ibid.* p. 22. Cp. *New Statistical Acc. of Scotland* (Kincardine), XI. 340.

4 5 *Family of Burnett*, pp. 29–30.

,, 34 The *Tulchan Episcopate.* It was a popular belief that a tulchan, *i.e.* a calf's skin stuffed with straw, when set beside a cow at milking-time made her yield her milk more freely. Those ministers who were made bishops on condition that they assigned their temporalities to the nobles were called "Tulchan Bishops."

5 12 sq. *Family of Burnett*, p. 131.

,, 25 sq. *Supp. Hist. Own Time* (H. C. Foxcroft), pp. 452–3.

6 1 *Family of Burnett*, p. 131.

,, 16 sq. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 458.

,, 37 The *Five Articles* of Perth were (1) That the Communion be received kneeling, (2) That it be administered in private to the sick, (3) That Baptism might be administered in certain cases in private, (4) Confirmation, (5) That Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Pentecost be devoutly observed.

7 11 See Dr Sprott in *Doctrine of Schism in Ch. of Scot.*, p. 13 (Blackwood, 1902).

8 1 sq. *Johnston of Warriston* (Famous Scots Series), pp. 15–16.

,, 21 Will of Robert Burnet, 1651, Edinburgh Register House.

9 5 Edinburgh Register of Baptisms.

10 3 sq. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 459.

,, 11 *Family of Burnett*, p. 131.

,, 31 sq. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 459.

11 13 Edinburgh Register of Baptisms.

,, 36 *Misc. of Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. (1904) 335.

12 20 *Family of Burnett*, p. 132.

14 37 *Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. 335.

15 7 sq. *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 93 [fol. pag., I. 53].

,, 13 *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 96 [fol. pag., I. 55].

,, 27 sq. *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 103 [fol. pag., I. 58].

,, 41 *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 109 [fol. pag., I. 61]. Cp. Kirkton's *Hist.* pp. 54–5.

16 4 "Our nobility are nearly all wracked," Baillie's *Letters*, III. 249.

,, 27 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 143 [fol. pag., I. 80].

,, 36 sq. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 459.

,, 40 *Ibid.* p. 453.

17 6 Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 28. Cp. Brodie's *Diary*, Aug. 27th, 1661.

,, 12 *Family of Burnett*, p. 133.

,, 23 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 454.

,, 29 *Ibid.*

,, 33 *Ibid.*

18 24 *Pref. Hist. Own Time.*

,, 31 *Pref. Memoirs of the Dukes of Hamilton.*

PAGE LINE

19 4 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 455.
,, 30 *Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. 335.
,, 38 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 455.
20 12 For the King's Letter see Wodrow's *Hist.* Fol. ed. I. 13.
,, 19 A Probationer or Licentiate of the Church of Scotland is one who is licensed by the Presbytery to preach but is not yet ordained.
,, 27 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 228 [fol. pag., I. 127].
,, 35 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 458.
21 6 *Ibid.* p. 458.
,, 26 *Ibid.* p. 459.

CHAPTER II.

22 16 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 195 [fol. pag., I. 127].
23 12 Wodrow's *Hist.* I. Apr. 1661.
,, 15 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 218 [fol. pag., I. 120].
24 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 460.
,, 28 sq. *Ibid.* p. 3.
25 9 *Ibid.* p. 4.
,, 24 *Ibid.* p. 460.
,, 31 *Ibid.* p. 3.
,, 41 *Ibid.* p. 2.
26 18 *Hist. Own Time*, ed Airy, I. 385 [fol. pag., I. 215].
,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 35.
,, 38 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 462. Cp. *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 385 [fol. pag., I. 215].
27 16 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 460.
,, 33 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 252 [fol. pag., I. 143].
,, 37 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 11.
29 14 *Ibid.* p. 30.
30 9 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 249 [fol. pag., I. 141].
,, 30 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 31–32.
31 7 *Ibid.* p. 28. Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbert (who must be distinguished from his contemporary Sir Geo. Mackenzie of Rosehaugh, known in Scotland as "the Bluidy Mackenzie") was made a Judge in 1661, was removed for his share in "the Act of Billetting," but was restored in 1678. He became Earl of Cromarty in 1703.
,, 31 *Family of Burnett*, p. 133.
,, 35 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 188 [fol. pag., I. 103].
32 19 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 28.
33 10 *Ibid.* p. 29. Anna Mackenzie, second daughter of the Earl of Seaforth, married (1) Earl of Balcarres, (2) the Earl of Argyll. She was the friend of Richard Baxter, Cowley, and Sir Robert Moray. She was deservedly esteemed for her ability, refinement, and piety. See her *Life*, by Earl of Lindesay, 1868.
,, 29 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 262 [fol. pag., I. 149].
34 11 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 30.
,, 17 *Ibid.* p. 40.
35 26 *Ibid.*
36 31 *Ibid.* p. 41.
37 7 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 105–6 [fol. pag., I. 59].
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 44.
38 5 *Ibid.* p. 45.
,, 26 *Ibid.* p. 46. John Tillotson (1630–94), at this date Rector of Keddington, Suffolk, afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury. Edward Stillingfleet (1635–99), at this time Rector of Sutton, afterwards became Bishop of Worcester. He was already known for his learning. John Wilkins, Master of Trinity, Cambridge, deprived at the Restoration, was at this time Secretary of the Royal Society. He afterwards became Bishop of Chester.
,, 28 *Ibid.* p. 463.

PAGE LINE

38 33 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 463.
39 1 *Ibid.*
,, 6 *Ibid.*
,, 13 *Ibid.* p. 47.
,, 21 John Wallis (1616–1703), Savilian professor of Geometry at Oxford, and a founder of the Royal Society. He acted as secretary to the Westminster Assembly. (*Dict. Nat. Biogr.*)
,, 32 *Ibid.* p. 464. "Robert Boyle" defines in general the character of all succeeding chemists....Beginning with Boyle these men gradually displaced the alchemical "simple perfect essence" by a thorough going belief in from seventy to eighty elements. R. K. Duncan, *The New Knowledge* (1905), p. 139.
40 39 See Lauderdale's account of Warriston's trial, Laud. Pap. July 28th, 1663. Cp. Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, pp. 134–5.
41 2 Laud. Pap. July 10th, 1663.
,, 33 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 184–5 [fol. pag., I. 101–2].
43 23 Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 130.
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 84.
,, 41 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 370 [fol. pag., I. 206]. Cp. Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, p. 116.
44 16 Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, ed. 1821, p. 165.
,, 24 Lady Margaret Burnet's *Letters*, p. 32.
,, 30 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 85.
45 3 *Ibid.* p. 86.
,, 23 *Ibid.*
,, 36 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 187 [fol. pag., I. 102].
46 9 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 86.
47 3 Cockburn's *Specimen*, pp. 28–9.
48 8 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 89.
,, 24 Mr Gilbert Burnet elected Mar. 23, 1663(4) apparently never "admitted." Thomson, *Hist. Royal Soc.* (1812), List of fellows, XXIV.
,, 27 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 90.
,, 38 *Ibid.* p. 93.
49 3 *Ibid.* p. 92.
,, 24 *Ibid.*
50 1 *Ibid.* p. 94.
,, 8 *Ibid.* p. 95.
,, 16 *Ibid.* p. 96. For character of Alexander Morus, see Bayle, *Biogr. Universelle.*
,, 27 *Ibid.* p. 467.
,, 38 *Ibid.* p. 97.
51 2 *Ibid.* p. 96.
,, 21 *Ibid.* p. 98.
,, 30 *Ibid.* p. 88.
,, 37 Saltoun Kirk Session Records. Cp. Haddington Presby. Records. The members of the Presbytery do not "supply the pulpit" of Saltoun Church after Oct. 9th, 1664.

CHAPTER III.

52 2 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 253 [fol. pag., I. 143].
,, 13 Kirkton, ed. by C. K. Sharpe, p. 141. Cp. Cunningham's *Ch. Hist.* II. 142.
,, 18 Haddington Presbytery Records, 1664.
,, 28 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 468.
53 7 *Ibid.* p. 469.
,, 15 Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 32.
54 21 Haddington Presbytery Records, 1662. Cp. Scott's *Fasti Eccles. Scotic* on parishes of Haddington Presbytery.
55 3 See Hay of Craignethans Diary, *Scot. Hist. Soc.* Introd.
,, 8 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 469.
,, 34 Haddington Presbytery Records, 1665.
,, 44 *Ibid.*

PAGE LINE

56 7 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 88. Cp. Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 31.
,, 24 seq. Saltoun Kirk Sess. Records, 1662–85.
,, 37 Haddington Presbytery Records.
57 13 Hume Brown's *Travellers in Scotland*, p. 232. Cp. Burnet's Memorial to Bishops. *Scot. Hist. Misc.* II. 355.
,, 18 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 471.
,, 32 *Ibid.* p. 470.
58 10 *Ibid.*
,, 19 Saltoun Kirk Sess. Records, Oct. 1666.
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 471.
,, 33 Haddington Presbytery Records, 1665.
59 1 There is one change that must be noted in the Kirk Session, the Elders were not ordained nor could the Session send an Elder to the superior Courts during the Episcopal period.
,, 6 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 273 [fol. pag., I. 157]. Cp. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 32.
,, 11 Saltoun Kirk Sess. Records, 1666.
,, 27 *Ibid.* Oct. 1666.
,, 30 "Young Hermingston" was probably Henry St Clair only and orphaned son of John St Clair and Catherine Mistress of Sinclair. He afterwards became Lord Sinclair. At this time he was about ten years of age. The order of the Presbytery is "to come to Hermingston and give an account of his "carriage to M^rs^ Calderwood Charteris and Burnet." Haddington Presby. Records, Feb. 23, 1668. Cp. *St Clairs of the Isles*, by St Clair, p. 306.
60 2 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 678.
,, 11 Saltoun Kirk Sess. Records, 1636. Cp. Haddington Presbytery Records, July 5, 1666.
,, 33 Haddington Presbytery Records, April 13, 1665.
61 8 Scott's *Fasti Eccles. Scotic*, parish of Haddington, 1662–74.
,, 33 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 472. Cp. *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed., I. 387–9 [fol. pag., I. 217].
62 9 Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 35.
,, 23 *Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. 340 (H. C. Foxcroft).
,, 35 *Ibid.* p. 342.
63 18 *Ibid.* pp. 343–7. For other side of the case see Cockburn's *Specimen*, pp. 35–39.
64 13 *Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. 348.
,, 22 *Ibid.* p. 350.
,, 31 *Ibid.* pp. 351–2.
65 5 *Ibid.* p. 353.
,, 16 *Ibid.* pp. 353–5.
,, 37 *Ibid.* pp. 355–6.
66 10 *Ibid.* pp. 357–8.
,, 27 Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 39.
,, 40 *Ibid.* p. 42.
67 15 For Burnet's letter to the Bishop of Edinburgh see *Trans. Soc. Antiq. Scot.* Edin., 1812, pp. 353–5. I owe my knowledge of this letter to the kindness of my friend the Rev. John Kerr, M.A., Minister of Dirleton.
68 26 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 388 [fol. pag., I. 217–8].
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 472.
69 7 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 423 [fol. pag., I. 236].
,, 20 *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 424 [fol. pag., I. 237].
,, 28 Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 33.
,, 39 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 472.
70 7 *Johnston of Warriston* (Famous Scots Series), p. 16.
,, 14 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 475.
,, 38 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 431 [fol. pag., I. 241]. Cp. *Lauderdale Papers*, II. 16.
71 10 *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 440 [fol. pag., I. 246].
,, 23 *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 441 [fol. pag., I. 247].
72 4 See Lauderdale—Tweeddale Papers, 1668, as to the object of the Indulgence.
,, 29 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 475–6.

PAGE LINE

73 36 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 475–6, also Burnet's *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 501 [fol. pag., I. 277].
74 19 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 507 [fol. pag., I. 281].
,, 37 The English work referred to was the *Friendly Debate between a Conformist and Nonconformist*, by Simon (afterwards Bishop) Patrick.
75 20 The lines are from Colville's Mock Hudibras.
,, 23 For the king's letter see Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 304, ed. 1721. Cp. *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 507 [fol. pag., I. 281].
76 16 For Tweeddale's object see Lauderdale—Tweeddale Letters, Aug. 1668.
,, 35 *Lauderdale Papers*, II. 166.
77 21 Mackenzie's *Hist.* pp. 159–60.
,, 33 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 512–3 [fol. pag., I. 285].
78 7 *Lauderdale Papers*, II. 151.
,, 29 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 477. Cunningham—a contemporary—whose writings show a personal animus against Burnet, declares that the ministry of the latter in Saltoun was unpopular. He evidently confuses the Saltoun period with Burnet's work in the west of Scotland. *Hist. of Great Britain*, I. 30 (ed. 1690).

CHAPTER IV.

80 5 *Early Travellers in Scotland*, Hume Brown, pp. 237 and 249.
,, 15 *Ibid.* p. 289.
81 8 *Munimenta Universitatis Glasguensis* (1854), III. 393.
,, 40 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 478.
83 8 Kirkton's *Hist. of Church of Scot.* (Sharpe's ed.), p. 193.
,, 28 For Burnet's opinion of Hamilton see *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 238 [fol. pag., I. 471].
,, 38 *Domestic Annals of Scotland* (R. Chambers), III. 336.
84 5 For the charge of heresy and Burnet's answer see McWard's *True Nonconformist* and Burnet's *Vindicat. of Church of Scotland.*
,, 24 Elliot's *Specimen*, p. 6.
,, 27 Cunningham's *Hist. of Great Britain*, p. 30.
,, 39 Cleland's *Poem on Highland Host.*
85 2 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 96.
,, 5 Kirkton's *Hist.* p. 294.
,, 19 Archbishop Burnet resigned on Dec. 24, 1669.
,, 24 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 518 [fol. pag., I. 288].
,, 31 *Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 516 [fol. pag., I. 287].
86 27 *Ibid.* Cp. Wodrow's *Hist.* Fol. ed. 1721, I. 325.
87 40 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 519 [fol. pag., I. 289].
88 33 For Assertory Act, *supra* p. 77.
89 26 *Hist. Own Time*, I. 520 [fol. pag., I. 290]. Cp. Wodrow, I. 333.
90 12 For a full account of the accommodation see *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 520–30 [fol. pag., I. 290–8] and Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 333–8.
,, 19 Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 335.
,, 29 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 497–8 [fol. pag., I. 274].
91 10 *Ibid.* I. 521–2 [fol. pag., I. 291].
,, 23 *Ibid.*
,, 36 *Lauderdale Papers*, II. 200.
92 3 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 524 [fol. pag., I. 293].
,, 24 Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 334.
Note. Precept drawn on cash-keeper, Sir W. Sharp (brother of the Archbishop), for payment to Mr Gilbert Burnet, Mr James Nairn, Mr Laurence Charteris, Mr Patrick Cook, Mr Walter Paterson, and Mr James Aird, each of them £25 sterling for their charges and expenses in supplying of vacancies in some churches in the west. Treasury Sederunt Bk, 1667–72.
,, 37 Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 334.
93 5 Kirkton's *Hist.* pp. 293–4.
,, 30 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 524–5 [fol. pag., I. 293].
94 6 "We stayed three months," Sept. to Nov. 1670, Haddington Presb. Records.

PAGE	LINE	
94	32	Conference at Paisley, *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 527 [fol. pag., I. 295]. For fuller account see Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 336, and Burnet's *Vindic. of Church of Scotland*, Dialogue IV.
95	24	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 529 [fol. pag., I. 296–7]. Cp. Wodrow, I. 336.
,,	34	Kincardine to Lauderdale Jan. 21, 1671. Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House. I am much indebted to Miss Foxcroft for the valuable quotations from the Ham House Papers in Pt I.
96	30	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 530 [fol. pag., I. 297].
,,	36	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 497 [fol. pag., I. 274].
97	19	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 531 [fol. pag., I. 298].
,,	25	*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 479.
,,	34	*Ibid.*
98	5	For Earl of Clarendon's application see Wodrow's *Analecta*, IV. 298, Nov. 1731. There is great confusion of dates in Wodrow's account.
,,	7	Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 47.
99	5	Hickes' *Discourses* on Burnet.
,,	15	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 531–2 [fol. pag., I. 298].
100	5	For Burnet's presence in London in Aug. 1671 see *Hist. Own Time*, I. 548 [fol. pag., I. 305].
,,	9	*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 479.
,,	12	For Moray's assistance see Hamilton's *Memoirs*, Pref.
,,	17	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 41 [fol. pag., I. 27].
,,	20	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 533 [fol. pag., I. 298].
,,	32	*Ibid.*
101	5	*Ibid.*
,,	24	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 437 [fol. pag., I. 245].
,,	40	Lauderdale seems to have told Kincardine that Burnet acted on his own initiative in addressing Tweeddale. "I know not what to say of Gilbert's "medling in that affaire of E. T. but it is like himself a great deal more "forward than prudent." Kinc. to Laud. Nov. 7, 1671, Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House.
102	3	*Hist. Own Time*, ed Airy, I. 534 [fol. pag., I. 299]. Cp. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 480.
,,	10	Leighton apparently accepted the Archbishopric of Glasgow about the end of Sept. 1671. On Oct. 21st, 1671, Kincardine writes to Lauderdale, "I had a letter from Mr Burnet of the 6th somewhat hard to be under- "stood, but it seems to be that the Bp. of Dublaine's letter was not "satisfactory and that therefore you would send to him no command to "accept. But I think I told you positively he had accepted so that "he needs no command to do it." Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House.
,,	12	Leighton to Burnet, *Scot. Hist. Soc. Misc.*, II. 359.
,,	17	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 534–5 [fol. pag., I. 299].
103	26	Higgons on Burnet, pp. 159–65.
,,	32–5	For Burnet's account of this paper see *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. 1470–1 [fol. pag., I. 262], also *Reflections* [on Hickes] (Bp of Sarum's Vindication), pp. 76–8.
,,	note.	For particulars suppressed by Lauderdale see his letter May 7th, 1668. Lauderdale—Tweeddale Papers.
104	27	Kincardine to Lauderdale, 7th Nov. 1671 (Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House).
,,	41	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 536 [fol. pag., I. 300].
105	9	See Kincardine's letter, Dec. 7th, 1671, *Lauderdale Papers*, II. 218.
,,	33	Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House.
106	16	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 600–1 [fol. pag., I. 338].
,,	29	*Ibid.* Cp. *Lauderdale Papers*, Pref. to III.
,,	33	*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 482.
107	21	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 603 [fol. pag., I. 339].
,,	23	"I got some to be considered," etc. There is a letter dated Edin., Jan. 7th, 1673, said to be addressed to Burnet by Andrew Kennedy, who had been suspected by the Government eight months before. He thanks his correspondent for his kind services with Lauderdale, the more generous and compassionate as they are not acquainted, and begs him to intercede once more in his behalf. Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 23135, p. 243.

PAGE	LINE	
107	40	Burnet's verses, Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 23135.
108	1	Maidment's *Pasquils*, p. 237.
,,	19	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 603 [fol. pag., I. 339].
109	10	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 605 [fol. pag., 340–1].
,,	32	The book was written before Sept. 1672 and probably published *before* Burnet went to London and had the crucial interview with Lauderdale, which he described to the Commons. See Pref. to *Vindicat. of Ch. of Scot.* 1673, and *Reflections* [on Hickes] (Bp of Sarum's Vindic.) (1696), pp. 66–7.
110	4	See *Vindicat. of Ch. of Scot.* Preface.
,,	20	*Ibid.* pp. 16–17.
111	15	*Ibid.* pp. 310–11.
112	27	The paper that seems to represent the Duke's point of view (though it names him in the third person) states that "Lauderdale knew nothing "of the book till Burnet presented him with a copy." Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 26111, p. 2.
,,	30	*Reflections* [on Hickes] (Bp of Sarum's Vindic.), pp. 66–7.
113	8	*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 480–1.
,,	24	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, I. 605 [fol. pag., I. 341].
114	4	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, II. 25 [fol. pag., I. 355].
,,	30	*Parl. Hist.* IV. 503.
,,	34	The Militia Act (*supra*, p. 78) certainly put this in the King's power.
115	1	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 26 [fol. pag., I. 355].
,,	18	*Ibid.* II. 27 [fol. pag., I. 356].
,,	28	Cockburn's *Specimen*, p. 53.
,,	33	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 27 [fol. pag., I. 356].
116	9	*Ibid.* ed. Airy, I. 454 [fol. pag., I. 253].
,,	15	*Ibid.* II. 27–8 [fol. pag., I. 356–7].
117	20	*Ibid.* II. 38 [fol. pag., I. 362].
,,	32	*Ibid.*
118	21	*Lauderdale Papers*, II. 241, 244; III. 10.
,,	27	*Hist. Own Time*, ed Airy, II. 39 [fol. pag., I. 363].
119	1	For letter see Wodrow's *Hist.* I. *App.* p. 60.
121	34	*Lauderdale Papers*, III. 62–3.
122	30	*Ibid.* II. 238.
,,	41	*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XI., *App.* Pt VI.; *The MSS. of the Duke of Hamilton, K.T.*, pp. 148–9. See also *Life of Leighton* by Rev. D. Butler (1903), p. 476.
123	17	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 55 [fol. pag., I. 370]. Cp. *Lauderdale Papers*, III. 50–63.
124	21	Wodrow's *Hist.* I. 383.
,,	31	*Ladies of the Covenant* (1851), p. 224.
125	4	Lauderdale MSS. at Ham House. Lord Halton was Lauderdale's brother.
,,	12	Leibnitz (Dutens' edit.), VI. 238. Letter from Leibnitz to Thomas Burnet $\frac{17}{27}$ Juillet 1696.
,,	19	*Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 40 [fol. pag., I. 363].
,,	29	*Ibid.* II. 58 [fol. pag., I. 371–2].
126	3	Glasgow University Records, 1674.

CHAPTER V.

131	3	Burnet's *Auto.* (*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 484).
132	4	Lauderdale MSS. Ham House.
,,	33	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 58–9 [fol. pag., I. 371]. The living cannot have been that of St Giles', Cripplegate, as suggested in Dr Airy's note, since he refused that from consideration for another man. (*Life* by son appended to *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833 pp. 267–8 [fol. pag., II. 684].)
133	11	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 59–60, and n. [fol. pag., I. 372–3]; "Dr Burnett's "Examination" (Lauderdale MSS. Ham House); Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 32095, f. 203 (covering letter to the petition of Nov. 29).
134	3	For this incident see Hickes, *Some Discourses upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson*, pp. 18, 19; *Letter* from Moses Pitt to [Dr Hickes] published

PAGE LINE

1695, p. 16; letter of Mr Charles Hatton (Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. 6. 2, ff. 113[b]—quoted in the text); unpublished pamphlet by Hickes (Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, pp. 37–40).

135 3 The Duchess of Lauderdale seems to be indirectly attacked in the first sermon.
,, 5 Despite the fact, that Burnet, in the first sermon had so strongly censured the Court of Rome.
,, 10 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 62 [fol. pag., I. 373–4].
,, 14 *Ibid.* II. 72–3 [I. 379].
,, 19 Licensed Feb. 27, 167$\frac{4}{5}$.
136 6 from the bottom. For the whole of the following incident see the appended sources of information. *Grey's Debates*, III. 19, 30, 31; "Dr Burnet's "Examination" (Lauderdale MSS. Ham House); Comments on the same, apparently embodying Lauderdale's criticisms, and intended for the guidance of Lauderdale's supporters in the debate of April 29 (Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 26111, f. 2); *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 73–5 [fol. pag., I. 379–80]. Unluckily Burnet's own contemporary account, in a letter to Duke Hamilton (see *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* I., *App.* p. 113), is missing from the Hamilton archives.
137 2 Sir G. Mackenzie's *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland*, p. 316.
,, 10 *Grey's Debates*, III. 30.
,, 14 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 74 [fol. pag., I. 379–80].
,, 16 *Grey's Debates*, III. 31.
,, 25 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 74, n. [a]; *Grey's Debates*, III. 31–2.
138 4 Hickes, Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, p. 34.
,, 9 *Grey's Debates*, III. 68–9 [misprinted, 52, 53].
,, 24 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 75 [fol. pag., I. 380].
,, 28 *Auto.* (*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 484).
,, 33 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 75 [fol. pag., I. 380].
,, 2 from the bottom. Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, pp. 351–6.
139 4 *Auto.* (*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 484).
,, 9 *Fifty-Seventh Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, pp. 21, 24.
,, 15 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 75 [fol. pag., I. 380]; *Supp.* p. 484.
,, 24 *Hist. Own Time*, ed. Airy, II. 76–8 [fol. pag., I. 380–82].
,, 33 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 484–5.
,, 37 Law's *Memorialls* [Edin. 1818], p. 76.
,, 40 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 481.
140 3 Law's *Memorialls* [Edin. 1818], p. 75.
,, 6 Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, p. 315.
,, 9 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 481.
,, 10 See n. by Dartmouth on *Hist. Own Time*, fol. pag., I. 39, *suppressed in all editions of History, but given* in Rose's *Observations on* Fox's *James II*, App. No 6, p. lvi.
,, 27 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 85.
,, 35 *Ibid.* p. 481.
141 16 *Fifty-Seventh Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records.*
,, 22 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 485.
,, 24 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 75 [fol. pag., I. 380].
,, last line. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 485.
142 12 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 253 [fol. pag., II. 675].
,, 17 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 442 [fol. pag., I. 596] n.
,, 24 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 328 n. [fol. pag., II. 721].
,, 30 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 442 [fol. pag., I. 596] n. Onslow is mistaken as to the occasion. The sermon of Nov. 5, 1684, was among the shortest Burnet preached. See the *Sermon* as printed.
,, 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 488.
,, 39 *Ibid.* pp. 487–8.
143 23 Burnet's own account of the school will be found in *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. I. 331–39 [fol. pag., I. 186–91].
,, 29 *Ibid.* pp. 339–40 [191]; *Supp.* p. 487.
,, line last but one. Pref. to his trans. of More's *Utopia*.
144 15 *Criminal Letters against Dr Burnet; An Answer* [to the same] (in *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 152–157).

PAGE	LINE	
144	31	*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 485.
145	6	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 353 [fol. pag., I. 538].
146	21	The tract, though pub. anonymously, is assigned to Burnet by Moses Pitt, who printed it. See his *Letter* [to Dr Hickes] pub. 1695, p. 10.
147	12	See the curious passage in the *Life* of Sir Matthew Hale, pub. in 1681–2, which seems to allude covertly to this tract. It shows that Burnet's standpoint had changed in the interval [ed. Oxford 1806, pp. 50–53].
,,	18	Pollock, *Popish Plot*, pp. 57–8; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, II. 37.
,,	21	*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 485.
,,	33	*Ibid.* p. 486.
148	4	For whom see the Pref. to Professor Arber's reprint *Term Cat.* I. (p. xii).
,,	13	*Ibid.*
,,	15	*Ibid.* II. (p. ix).
,,	20	Dunton, *Life and Errors*, ed. 1701, p. 280.
,,	30	It was licensed Aug. 18, 1676, and appeared in 1677.
150	13	Cockburn, *Specimen of...Remarks...on...Burnet's History*...Remark II., Sect. X., pp. 60–63.
,,	29	This trans. left the Press June 1, 1676.
,,	34	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 106–7 [fol. pag., I. 396].
152	2	*Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XIII., *App.* 2, pp. 39–41, 49; *Lauderdale Papers*, III. 132.
,,	14	"One of the most necessary but...one of the most unacceptable (to me at "least) of all the labours of a Historian." Burnet, *Letter to the...Bishop of Coventry*...1693, p. 2. See also the *Life of Sir Matthew Hale*, ed. Oxford, 1806, p. 22.
,,	21	*Hist. Reform*, ed. Pocock VII. 67.
,,	26	*Ibid.* p. 123.
,,	29	They are amply discussed by Pocock, *op. cit.* Even Evelyn was annoyed, because the printer lost some papers Evelyn had lent for the purposes of the work. See his letter to Nicolson Nov. 10, 1699, appended to his *Diary* ["Chandos Library" ed.] p. 729.
153	11	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 156 [fol. pag., I. 424].
,,	last line.	*Ibid.* II. 162 [I. 427–8].
154	12	*Ibid.* II. 162–5 [I. 428–30].
,,	16	*Ibid.* II. 171–2 [I. 433–4].
155	11	Cf. with these tracts *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 200–1 [fol. pag., I. 451]. No stress can be laid on the curious story told by James II. [Macpherson's extracts from his Memoirs in *Original Papers*, I. 140; Echard *Hist.* III. 472.] The two versions do not coincide, and the identification of the third party with Burnet is a later gloss.
,,	22	Cf. *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 173, 178–9 [fol. pag., I. 434, 437–8] with *Supp.* p. 488. It is clear that the overture took place before Nov. 22. (*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 173 [fol. pag., I. 435].)
,,	34	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 173 [fol. pag., I. 434]; *Supp.* p. 488.
156	12	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 178 [fol. pag., I. 437].
,,	34	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 178–81 [fol. pag., I. 437–8].
,,	36	A letter of March 11, 1678 [9] describing Burnet as a pensioner of the Court, is in Bodl. MSS. Rawl. A. 175 (181^{b}).
157	3	The *fact* of such a betrayal is mentioned by Dartmouth, n. to *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 78 [fol. pag., I. 382]; Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 46; *Hist. MSS. Com. Portland MSS.* VII. 367–8. All these writers, commenting on the events of this date more than fifty years later, ascribe it to the epoch of the "Exclusion Bill" generally, which may be held to include this period. The suggestion as to the incrimination of James we derive from a comparison between *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 179 [fol. pag., I. 437], and *Eighteen Papers* (by Burnet), p. 205.
,,	11	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 181 [fol. pag., I. 439].
,,	30	Brit. Mus. MSS. Stow 549, f. 16.
,,	38	Pref. to *Hist. Reform.* II. 5.
158	12	*Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 211–218 [fol. pag., I. 455–460]. The statement that he *remonstrated* with Halifax really applies to the following year.
,,	28	*Ibid.* pp. 246–7 [476–7].

PAGE LINE

158 37 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, II. 234–6, 240.
159 2 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 299 [fol. pag., I. 507].
,, 5 *Life* appended to *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 271–6 [fol. pag., II. 686–9].
,, 8 Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, ff. 5–6.
,, 11 He did not succeed in averting this suspicion. See Dartmouth's n. to the letter, *in loco Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 276 [fol. pag., II. 689].
161 2 Memorandum by Burnet on the Bodl. draft.
,, 10 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 300 [fol. pag., I. 507].
,, 21 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 486.
,, 36 *The Infallibility of the Roman Church considered*, p. 1.
162 8 *Ibid.* p. 2.
163 1 *Ibid.* p. 12.
,, 8 *Ibid.*
,, 21 *Ibid.* pp. 34–5.
,, 26 See the correspondence in *Hist. Reform.* ed. Pocock VII. 25–51. It is on either side almost obsequiously effusive. The two men subsequently quarrelled and indulged in peevish recrimination.
,, 32 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 7.
,, 39 *Ibid.*
164 2 *Roy. Hist. Soc. Camden* (*3rd Ser.*) *Misc.* XI. 1–41.
,, 6 *Ibid.* p. 18.
,, 10 *Ibid.* p. 21.
,, 13 *Ibid.*
,, line 2 from the bottom. All this from *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 486.
165 1 *Life...of John...Earl of Rochester*, 1st ed. p. 125.
,, 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 486.
,, 9 *Life...of John...Earl of Rochester*, 1st ed. p. 141.
,, 24 *Roy. Hist. Soc. Cam.* (*3rd Ser.*) *Misc.* pp. 36–7.
,, 35 *Ibid.* p. 40. (Aug. 7.)
166 5 Bodl. MSS. Tanner, 37, ff. 143–4.
,, 1 from bottom. *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 300 [fol. pag., I. 507–8].
167 4 Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 50.
,, 33 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 218 [fol. pag., I. 459–60].
,, last line. *Ibid.* 256–7 [fol. pag., I. 481].
168 4 *Ibid.* p. 218 [459].
,, 12 *Ibid.* p. 256 [481].
,, 25 Evelyn's *Diary*, Dec. 22, 1680.
169 8 See the *Sermon* as pub., p. 25; Burnet's subsequent account of it in *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 261 [fol. pag., I. 483] is far from candid.
,, 16 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 105, n. 3.
,, 23 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 260 [fol. pag., I. 483].
,, last line but one. For this see *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 268–78 [fol. pag., I. 488–494], and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XI., *App.* 2, p. 43.
170 20 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 481–2 [fol. pag., I. 496–7].
,, 30 *Ibid.* II. 287 [I. 499].
,, 36 *Ibid.* II. 288 [I. 500].
171 7 *Ibid.* II. 287 [I. 499]. For a specimen of these pamphlets see the curious Groaning Board "series"; i.e. *Notes conferr'd; or a dialogue between the Groaning Board and a Jesuit* (*relating to Dr Burnet*), London, 1682, fol.; *A sober vindication of the Rev. Dr and the harmless Board...* London, 1682, s. sh. fol.; *The last words and sayings of the true Protestant Elm Board... with...a conference between Dr B. and the said Board* (London, 1682, s. sh. fol.); *A real vindication of Dr B....* London, 1682, s. sh. fol.; *More last words...a full answer to the late pretended...vindication of the Dr and the Board*, London, 1682, s. sh. fol. Copies of these rare pasquils are in the Bodl. Library.
,, 14 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 100–8.
,, 35 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 299 [fol. pag., I. 507].
,, 38 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 108.
,, last line. *Ibid.* p. 488.
172 25 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 299–301 [fol. pag., I. 507–8].
,, 30 *Ibid.* II. 288 [I. 500].

PAGE LINE

173 2 Wodrow's *Analecta*, II. 371.
,, 8 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 288 [fol. pag., I. 500]; *Supp.* p. 107 and n.
,, 28 *Hist. Own Time*, II. 313–19 [fol. pag., I. 515–19].
,, 30 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 101–2. Identified by the present writer.
,, 36 He alludes to Phillip. iv. 5 "τὸ επιεικὲς ὑμῶν" translated "your moderation" in A.V. May be also translated "that which is meet" or "equitable"; in R.V. "forbearance" (margin "gentleness").
176 11 See Wodrow, *Hist.* II., App. LXV. (note contributed by Mr Clarke).
,, 21 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 318–19 [fol. pag., I. 519]. For a criticism of Burnet's numbers see Matthieson, *Politics and Religion in Scotland*, II. 299.
,, 23 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 (*MSS. of the Marquis of Bath at Longleat*), I. 45–6.
,, 36 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 321 [fol. pag., I. 520–1].
,, 39 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, f. 5.
,, 41 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 324 [fol. pag., I. 522].
177 8 Strype's ed. of Stow's *London*, ed. 1720, III. 252.
,, 9 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 485 n.; *Eighteen Papers*, p. 157; Letter to Compton of July 30, 1683 (Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 61).
,, 15 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 489.
,, 36 Laurence Hyde, second son of the great Chancellor.
178 2 Malcolm's *Granger* [*Correspondence*], pp. 226–7. This volume (to which my attention was kindly drawn by Professor Firth) appeared in 1805. Ten years later certain of these letters to Mrs Wharton were independently printed, apparently from another and a less reliable MS., in the *Gentleman's Mag.* 1815, LXXXV. part i.
,, 10 Malcolm's *Granger*, p. 238; *Gent. Mag.* 1815, LXXXV. part i. 306.
,, 12 This is the reading of *Gent. Mag.*, and seems better than the "commanding" of *Granger*.
,, 19 Malcolm's *Granger*, p. 244 [*Gent. Mag.* 1815, LXXXV. part i. 397]. The letter is undated, but may belong to Dec.—Jan. 1682–3.
,, 3 from bottom. *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 278–9 [fol. pag., II. 690–1]. It is there dated Oct. 16, 1682. If Mrs Wharton's letters are correctly dated, it should rather be *Dec.* 16.
179 3 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 342 [fol. pag., I. 532].
,, 8 Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 3.
,, 12 See *infra*, p. 191; Evelyn's *Diary*, April 12, 1681. For Brisbane, see Evelyn's *Diary*, Oct. 26, 1683; Fountainhall, *Historical Observes*, p. 136; Firth, *Diplomatic Relations of England and France*, pp. 24–5.
,, 16 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 342 [fol. pag., I. 532].
,, 38 Letter of 14 July [1681], Malcolm's *Granger*, pp. 220–4 [*Gent. Mag.* LXXXV. part i. 494–5].
180 2 *Ibid.* p. 243. [*Ibid.* p. 397.]
,, 16 For Milton, see *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. I. 284; for Beaumont, Fletcher and Jonson, see *infra*, p. 202; for Tasso I have lost the reference.
,, 30 Malcolm's *Granger*, pp. 228–9.
181 5 *Ibid.* pp. 236–8.
,, 25 Letter of Nov. 8 [1682] (*ibid.* p. 248 [*Gent. Mag.* LXXXV. part ii. 499]).
,, 33 See Pearson's *Leighton*, I. 78 n., and Burnet's letter to Fall of Feb. 15 [1682–3] quoted above on p. 179. [Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 3.]
,, 35 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart* is strong on the essential Erastianism of Louis.
182 4 By the brief Appendix entitled *News from France*. It is in the form of a letter, and though published by Burnet, was probably written by Fall.
,, 26 See *Animadversion* [on the History of the Rights of Princes], 1682 [anon.]; Burnet's *Answer to the Animadversion*, 1682; [Comber] to Burnet, Dec. 20, 1682 (Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 14); copy of letter from Burnet to the Animadverter, Jan. 22, received Feb. 2, 1682–3, in Comber's hand with notes by Comber (Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. b. 2, f. 69); Comber to Sancroft, undated (Bodl. MSS. Tanner XXXII. 49); Burnet to the Animadverter 14 March, 1682–3 (Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 99); Comber to Sancroft, March 15, 1682[3] (Bodl. Tanner MSS. XXXV. 222); Birch's *Tillotson*, 2nd ed. pp. 378–9.
185 14 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 3. See also a letter to Sir Edward Harley, of the same date, *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 [*Longleat MSS.* I.] p. 44–5.

PAGE LINE

186 3 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 3.
,, 13 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 351 [fol. pag., I. 537–8].
,, 16 *Ibid.* p. 332 [526].
,, 18 *Ibid.* p. 357 [541].
,, 19 *Ibid.* p. 332 [526].
187 2 *Ibid.* pp. 355–6 [540–1].
,, 10 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 488–9. See also a remarkable passage from *Representation of threatening dangers* [by Robert Ferguson], 1688, quoted in James Ferguson's *Robert Ferguson the Plotter*, p. 255.
,, 23 See *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 494; and cf. with *infra*, pp. 192–3. (This corrects to some extent my assumptions in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 1, which presumed the Memoirs to have been *commenced* after Russell's death.)
,, 29 See *infra*, pp. 192–3.
188 8 Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks*, p. 66.
,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 110.
189 2 *Ibid.* and *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 294, 363–4 [fol. pag., I. 503–4, 546].
,, 22 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 116.
,, 26 *Ibid.* pp. 116–7.
,, 35 *Ibid.* p. 118. In *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 368–9 [fol. pag., I. 550] he says he was threatened with imprisonment for his attentions to Baillie.
190 10 See the report in *State Trials*.
,, 23 *Supp. to Hist. Own Time*, p. 126.
193 17 This letter, as originally printed, was dated Sunday, July 17; which is obviously incorrect. It first appeared in Mark Napier's *Montrose and the Covenanters* (1838), I. 14–18; reappeared in the same author's *Memorials... of...Dundee*, I. 46–9, and was quoted in *Notes and Queries*, Ser. I. VII. 59–60; but the present writer's attention was first called to it by the courtesy of Mr Clarke.
,, 31 See the words which he added to his Memoirs when, twenty years later, he transformed his Memoirs into the *Hist. Own Time*. He there calls July 13, 1683 "this tragical day, in which I lost the two best friends I had in "the world." Cf. *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 372, ll. 26–8 with *Supp.* p. 120, l. 29.
194 8 Lord [John] Russell's *Life of William Lord Russell*, 3rd ed. II. 265, 274 (see also pp. 117–119 and *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 130); *Life of Halifax*, I. 391 and n. 1.
,, 10 Russell's *Russell*, 3rd ed. II. 262–3; *The General Dict.* [founded on Bayle], ed. 1734–41, VIII. art. Russell, pp. 817–20 nn.
,, 13 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 371 [fol. pag., I. 552].
,, 25 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 (*Longleat MSS.* I.), pp. 46–7 (letter dated 19 July [1683]).
195 5 All this from Lord Halifax's memorandum given in his *Life*, I. 393–4. Burnet's own account appears in *General Dict.* [founded on Bayle], ed. 1734–41, VIII. 821 n.; and the date on l. 33 is supplied by Russell's *Russell*, ed. 3, II. 81–2.
,, 10 Compare *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 378 [fol. pag., I. 557], with *Supp.* p. 130.
,, 16 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 131.
,, 19 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34526, f. 18 [copies of Woburn MSS. (from the collection of Sir James Mackintosh)].
,, 21 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 130.
,, 28 See the passage in Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 61^{b}.
196 2 Birch's *Life of Tillotson*, 2nd ed. pp. 102–10.
,, 13 Russell's *Russell*, ed. 3, II. 273; *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 380 [fol. pag., I. 558].
,, 19 It will be found in Russell's *Russell*, ed. 3, II. 262–79.
197 5 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 384–6 [fol. pag., I. 561–2].
,, 12 *Ibid.* p. 441 [596].
,, 14 Napier's *Memorials of...Dundee*, II. 367 (Moray to Aberdeen, Whitehall, July 28, 1683).
,, 23 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 488.
,, 29 *Ibid.* p. 489.

PAGE LINE

197 32 See the *General Dict.* [founded on Bayle], ed. 1734–41, VIII. 821 n.
,, 34 His letter is in Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 61 [July 30].
,, 38 Birch's *Tillotson*, ed. 2, p. 317; *General Dict.* [founded on Bayle], ed. 1734–41, VI. 154 n.
198 7 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 32–9; and cf. with *ibid.* pp. 1–2, modified by the terms of the Brisbane letter, with which the present writer was not acquainted at the time of editing the Supplement.
,, 27 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 47–50. This character was subsequently transmuted into the portrait which appears in the published *Hist.* Airy's ed. I. 166–9 [fol. pag., I. 93–4].
,, last line. It had been mentioned in his letter to Fall of Feb. 15 preceding.
199 6 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 (*Longleat MSS.* I.), p. 47.
,, 7 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34526, f. 16[b] [Russell Papers in Mackintosh collection].
,, 8 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* VII., *App.* p. 289.
,, 20 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 390–5 [fol. pag., I. 564–7].
,, 32 Wodrow, *Analecta*, III. 190, 319–20.
200 15 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* VII., *App.* pp. 343[a], 344 [Oct. 5, Oct. 16, 1683]. *Ibid.* 366[a], 290[b].
,, 19 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 391 [fol. pag., I. 565].
,, 31 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 392–5 [fol. pag., I. 565–7].
,, 32 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* VII., *App.* p. 291[a].
,, 36 See *Dr B...t's Farewell...* s. sh. fol. [1683] answered in *Doctor Burnet's Letter to his friend in London...* s. sh. fol. 1683. The former, as hinted in the text, attacks Burnet's private as well as his public character, accusing him of illicit commerce with a maid-servant; the latter, though not by Burnet (cf. *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 386 [fol. pag., I. 562]), may have been founded on a letter from him. See also another attack, *The true spirit and elixer of Cant: at the sign of the Groaning Board in Plot-Allee in Equity St. there lives an eminent Scotch Doctor, student in schism and sedition*, London, 1684, s. sh. fol.
,, last line. *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 402 [fol. pag., I. 571].
201 10 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 489.
,, 19 *Ibid.* pp. 120–3; *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 398–9 [fol. pag., I. 569–70].
,, 22 Letter to Sir Edward Harley, Nov. 20, *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 [*Longleat MSS.* I.], p. 47.
,, 24 Cf. letter to Rev. Rich. Davies, Bodl. MSS. D. 23, f. 16, and Burnet's *Reflections* [upon Hickes], pub. 1696, p. 88, with Burnet to Lady Russell (*Letters of Lady Russell*, 7th ed. 1809, p. 226).
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 489–90; see also *ibid.* p. 526; codicil to his will; Pref. to the Expos. of the XXXIX Art. ed. 3, p. iii.
202 17 See T. Wharton Jones' ed. *A True Relation* [Camden Soc. New Ser. IV.], pp. 100, 216–7.
,, 22 Burnet's *Reflections* [upon Hickes], pub. 1696, p. 88.
,, 34 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 [*Longleat MSS.* I.], p. 47.
,, 38 *Ibid.* p. 48.
203 2 *Ibid.* p. 49.
,, 3 Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, ff. 16–25; Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], 1696, pp. 87–9.
,, 10 T. Wharton Jones' ed. *A True Relation* [Camden Soc. New Ser. IV.], pp. 104–5, 116, 123, 126, 136, 138–9, 186–7, 218–9.
,, 23 *Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. [1904] 359–70 [ed. by present writer].
,, 36 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 427–30 [fol. pag., I. 588–9].
204 11 See Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], p. 70. He there says, "I thought "myself bound to warn Mr Chiswell...[who] was much threatened at that "time for having printed *Julian*." Now [Johnson's] *Julian the Apostate* (1682) was "Printed for Langley Curtis"; his *Julian's Arts* (1683) by "Chiswell and Robinson."
,, 34 For all this see Wharton Jones' ed. *A True Relation* [Camd. Soc. New Ser. IV.], pp. 131–5 passim; *N. and Q.*, Ser. II. vol. VII. 429 (in this Mayor shows that some copies actually issued ungarbled; from others, we may remark, the incriminated pages (pp. 445–6) have been removed); Hickes, *Discourses* [on Burnet and Tillotson], pp. 26–33; Burnet's *Reflections* [on these], pp. 69–76; Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, ff. 16–25.

PAGE LINE

205 24 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 441–2 [fol. pag., I. 596]; Luttrell's *Diary*, I. 321.
,, 38 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 [*Longleat MSS.* I.], p. 49.
,, last line. *Life* of Halifax, I. 420–433.
206 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 138.
,, 13 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 [*Longleat MSS.* I.], p. 50.
,, 16 Cf. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 143–4 with *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 461–6 [fol. pag., I. 609–10].
,, 19 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 141–2. This reappeared with little alteration in *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 466–74 [fol. pag., I. 611–15].
,, last line. See *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 472 [fol. pag., I. 614]; *Supp.* p. 142.

CHAPTER VI.

207 16 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 143. See also Burnet's published *Speech* on the Occasional Conformity Bill, p. 5.
,, 20 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 144–5.
,, 26 *Ibid.* p. 151.
,, 29 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1904 [*Longleat MSS.* I.], p. 50.
208 2 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 151.
,, 15 *Ibid.* pp. 149–50.
209 7 *Ibid.* pp. 151–2.
,, 12 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 490.
,, 21 *Ibid.* p. 157. Burnet's own expression "in the night" almost suggests that the visit was clandestine.
,, 22 *A Letter writ by the...Bishop of Salisbury to the...Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield* [1693], p. 8.
,, 23 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 490.
,, 28 *Ibid.* p. 157; *Négociations de...d'Avaux in Hollande*, Paris, 1752–3, VI. 29 [13 Jan. 1687].
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 157, 227.
210 5 See *Ibid.* pp. 136–8, 187–90, 227–8, 229–42, 246, 255.
,, 23 *Ibid.* pp. 228–9.
,, 27 *Ibid.* pp. 202–3; and cf. with *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 657–8.
,, 29 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 157, 266; Ranke *Eng. Gesch.*, ed. 1859–68, VII. App. II. 164.
211 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 204–5.
,, 29 See [Burnet's anonymous] *Animadversions* on the *Reflections* the published version occasioned [p. 33].
,, 32 Bodl. MSS. Hearne, *Diaries*, lxxxiii. 87; Cockburn, *Specimen of Remarks*, pp. 58–9; Cunningham, *History*, I. 60, etc., etc.
213 33 For the Roman visit see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 661–3; *Supp.* pp. 172, 490; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 268; for the ludicrously anachronistic suspicions subsequently entertained by the Jacobites see Ferguson's *History of the Revolution*, 1706, p. 11; *Robert Ferguson the Plotter*, by James Ferguson, p. 370; Bodl. MSS. Hearne, *Diaries*, lvii. 5 [quoting *An address to the Peers of England*, 1716].
214 19 For this paragraph see Burnet's *Letters*, ed. 1724, pp. 271, 273; the preface concerning persecution prefixed in 1687 to his transl. of the pseudo-Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*; and many subsequent works *passim*, especially the *Sermon on the Brief for the persecuted exiles of the Principality of Orange*, 1704, pp. 15–21. On the pretexts of Louis see Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 103, 107–12, and *Life* of Halifax, I. 162, and n. 9. For the strong disapprobation of the Pope, see Klopp, *op. cit.* III. 100–1.
,, 26 *Letters*, ed. 1724, p. 274.
,, 29 For the experience of Le Clerc, see *Account of...John le Clerc*, pub. by Curll in 1712, p. 6.
,, 40 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 490–1.
215 7 *Ibid.* pp. 247–50.
,, 23 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 688.

PAGE LINE

215 27 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 491.
,, 31 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 691.
216 2 Luttrell's *Diary*, I. 213, 284, 307.
,, 4 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 39, 495–6.
,, 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 152–3 [written in 1686 or 1687]. This is confirmed to some extent by Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 40.
,, 32 On the sinister connection of events, see the speech of the Bishop of Valence, Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 128.
,, 37 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 249.
217 2 He was the channel through which Fatio warned the Prince of a plot against him, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 689; Brewster's *Memoirs...of Sir Isaac Newton*, ed. Edinburgh, 1855, II. 37 n.
,, 12 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 691.
,, 19 *Ibid.* pp. 691–2 (cf. *Supp.* pp. 491 and 221–3).
,, 22 *Ibid.* pp. 692, 762 (and cf. Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], p. 57).
,, 25 *Ibid.* p. 692; *Supp.* p. 491; Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 101. But Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 163, shows that in the spring of this year the Prince had been obliged to clear himself of the charge of corresponding with Compton.
,, 28 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 308–9.
,, 38 *Ibid.* p. 197. He knew of it afterwards (*ibid.* p. 309), but no one was privy at the time (*ibid.* line 1).
218 1 Sydney and Burnet were certainly intimate. See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 247; and Stanley's letter of Aug. $\frac{1}{11}\frac{8}{8}$, 1686 (Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 102) "Dr B. hath no body in this family that speaks to him or counten-"anceth him, but only a Frenchman and Colonel Sydney."
,, 8 See *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 692 (from "this would lay," to "sense of "our affairs").
,, 25 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 691.
,, 27 See *infra*, p. 223; from Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 110.
219 20 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, ff. 101^{6}–2; see also ff. 103, 109 (letters of Dec. $\frac{2}{12}\frac{4}{1}$, 1686, Feb. $\frac{1}{2}\frac{8}{8}$, $168\frac{8}{9}$).
221 11 Cf. with this *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 686–7; *Supp.* p. 250.
,, 27 A reconvert from Rome, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 679–80.
,, 28 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 1: addressed "For Doctor Fall" [description added by later hand].
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 250–1, 491.
222 16 *Hist. Own Time*, I. 693–4 [*Supp.* p. 227].
,, 21 The expostulation was the first duty of D'Albeville, who had his first audience $\frac{7}{17}$ Jan. $168\frac{8}{9}$. See Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 280; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], p. 708 [*Supp.* p. 251]. Cf. *Hist. Own Time*, I. 692; D'Avaux, *Négociations*, French ed. VI. 29.
,, 24 D'Avaux, *Négociations*, French ed. VI. 48, 50–1 (March 27, April 24, 1687).
,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 190–3.
223 6 *Ibid.* pp. 194–6.
224 6 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, f. 110. It is dated Loo, March $\frac{2}{3}\frac{4}{1}$; and acknowledges letters of Jan. 5 and Feb. 24 [$168\frac{6}{7}$].
,, 18 For her pedigree see *Life* (by their son) appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 695.
,, 37 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 491–2.
225 11 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 493.
,, 28 This was probably the second French version.
,, 29 Burnet's letters of July 24, Oct. 8, 31, Dec. 7 [1686]; May 13 [1687]. The originals are in the Library of the Remonstrant Community at Amsterdam [J. 13. e.—No. 5 R. K.; J. 13. c.—No. 3 R. K.; J. 13. a.—No. 1 R. K.; J. 13. d.—No. 4 R. K.; J. 13. b.—No. 2 R. K.]. Copies are in the Bodleian Library [MSS. Eng. th. c. 23].
,, 32 This is the letter of May 13 [1687].
226 14 "Pridie Calendas Novembris" (Oct. 31) [1687]; Jan. 16, 1688; Feb. 12, 1688. The originals are in the Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam [M. 19. j.—R. K.; M. 19. a.—R. K. No. 1; M. 19. b.—R. K. No. 2]. Copies are in the Bodleian Library [MSS. Eng. th. c. 23].

PAGE LINE

226 16 Letter of Jan. 16, 1688.
,, 31 ,, Oct. 31 [1687].
227 6 ,, Feb. 12, 1688.
228 3 ,, Jan. 16, 1688.
,, 8 ,, Feb. 12, 1688.
229 10 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. I. 586–8 [fol. pag., I. 328–9]; *Supp.* pp. 180, 198.
,, 16 Bayle, *Nouv. de la Rép. des Lettres*, March 1687 [p. 303].
,, 22 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XII., *App.* VII. 204; King's *Locke*, I. 314.
230 11 See also the remarkable animadversions of James during a conversation which had taken place before April 18. Klopp, III. 327. It should however be noticed that Burnet himself, and the authors of the *Town and Country Mouse*, traced Dryden's irritation to Burnet's refutation of Varillas, whose work Dryden, it was believed, wished to translate (*Nouv. de la Rép. des Lettres*, Dec. 1686, p. 1472, Burnet's reply to M. Varillas, pp. 138–40). Scott ascribed it to some previous attack by Burnet upon Dryden's immorality. But we have not come across any such.
231 9 See for example Burnet, *A defence of the Reflections on...Mr Varillas*...pp. 138–40; *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. I. 487 [fol. pag., I. 269].
,, 12 Fountainhall, *Hist. Notices*, I. 816; *Eighteen Papers* (by Burnet), p. 37; *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 251.
232 8 *Eighteen Papers* by Burnet, p. 37 (postscript to the Tract).
,, 10 Burnet thought so, see *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 251.
,, 12 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 493.
,, 16 *Ibid.* p. 251.
,, 18 *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 149–55.
,, 28 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 493.
,, 36 *Ibid.* pp. 251–2.
233 24 *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 147–9.
,, 39 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 520–1.
234 9 *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 156–166.
,, 16 *Ibid.* pp. 169–71.
,, 19 He got a very "dry" response when he remonstrated with the Prince. D'Avaux, *Négociations*, French ed. VI. 77 (7 August, 1687).
,, 24 It is mentioned in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 522, 525.
,, 28 D'Avaux, *Négociations*, French ed. Sept. $\frac{1}{11}$, 1687, VI. 95.
,, 39 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 252–3.
235 17 *Ibid.* p. 253. See also a dignified allusion to his danger in his letter of Jan. 19, 1688 to Van Limborch, referring to the sympathy of the latter; and the story in Mazure, II. 388, that he asked and obtained police protection. No authority is given.
,, 22 Lady Russell, Letter of Oct. 9, 1687 (*Letters*, collected by Sellwood, 7th ed., p. 137).
,, 33 Klopp gives Dec. 27, 1687 as the date of one demand, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 417.
,, 36 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 728–9.
236 1 The "Johnston letters" quoted by Macaulay, who however gives no reference to them. He probably saw them in the Macintosh copies (unnamed) now numbered as Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34515. The above passage occurs at f. 41.
,, 5 Mazure, II. 343, 389; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 404, 419, 422.
,, 10 Mazure, II. 342, Klopp, III. 417.
,, 18 Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 34515, ff. 45–6, 48^b, 50^b, 55 (Johnston letters).
,, 30 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 730–1; *Supp.* pp. 168, 269.
,, 33 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34515, f. 55.
237 3 See for all this, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 730–1; *Supp.* pp. 268–9; *Life*, appended to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 694–5; Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34515, f. 55.
,, 9 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* V., *App.* p. 319^a [April 2, 1688].
,, 21 See Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], 1696, p. 58.
238 8 For the general belief that a republican revolution was probable see Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, III. 329, 382, 427, 429, IV. 2, 71.
,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 261–2.

PAGE LINE

238 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 266.
,, 38 See *ibid.* pp. 266–8.
,, 40 See for instance his controversies with Bishop Parker, on which see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 740; Evelyn, *Diary*, March 23, 1687–8; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* III., *App.* p. 273.
239 6 Lady Russell's *Letters*, ed. Sellwood, 7th ed., p. 157 [April 6, 1688]; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XIV., *App.* IV. 187; Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34515, ff. 61–2. The tract itself is in *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 65–82. For the political importance of the tract he answered, see Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 13.
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 288–9 (written about June 1691)
240 11 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 39–42, 57 treats of these.
,, 15 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 274–5.
,, 18 Dalrymple, *Memoirs*, II. Bk V. *App.* pp. 167–84.
,, 40 *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 110–8.
241 3 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 273; *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 93–4.
,, 6 Burnet in *Hist. Own Time* does not mention the invitation. In his Memoirs (*Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 292) he seems to suppose that Henry Sydney was the bearer.
,, 12 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 277, 286. In the latter he mentions that he had known of William's purpose "since the beginning of July."
,, 17 *Ibid.* "Setting" is probably the true version; though the existing MSS. and in consequence the printed version give "settling."
242 12 *Dr Burnet's Vindication of himself from the Calumnies* [*of*]...*Parliamentum Pacificum* [*Eighteen Papers*, pp. 172–88].
,, 22 *Op. cit.* pp. 16–17.
243 4 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 287; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 776.
,, 24 *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 83–96.
,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 494–5.
244 6 *Ibid.* p. 495.
,, 12 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 776.
,, 17 It will be found in *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 119–32.
,, 18 See Burnet's *Reflections* [upon Hickes], p. 58.
246 14 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 757–8.
,, 31 Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 79.
247 2 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 286; *Reflections* [upon Hickes], p. 59.
,, 22 It is printed in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 522–528.
248 8 See also the Pref. to his trans. of the pseudo-Lactantius *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 1687, pp. 23–4.
250 2 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 285–6.
,, 8 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 781–2.

CHAPTER VII.

251 3 See Cunningham's sarcasms, *Hist.* I. 83.
,, 6 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 762.
,, 8 Printed in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 528–36.
,, 16 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 162.
,, 18 Cf. *ibid.* pp. 161–5.
,, 21 Not, as Macaulay says, on the Brill.
,, 22 The second "noon" of the *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag], I. 786, should be "nine"; see *Supp.* p. 297 ("Sunday night").
252 18 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 789. McCormick [*Carstares Papers*, p. 34] and Cunningham [*Hist.* I. 88] give accounts, evidently confused, of this conversation. Macaulay, *Hist. Eng.* [ed. 1858–62 (8 vols.), III. 224] adopts the version of Cunningham. For the account of the whole voyage see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 787–9; *Supp.* pp. 291–8; a news letter from Burnet [to his wife] Harl. MSS. 6798, art. 49 [ff. 264–8]; *N. and Q.*, ser. II., II. 244.
,, 30 *N. and Q.*, ser. I., IX. 175, from Salmon's *Lives of the English Bishops.*

PAGE LINE

253 3 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 530. See also his letter to his wife, quoted above [*N. and Q.*, ser. II., II. 244].
,, 11 *N. and Q.*, ser. II., II. 246[a].
,, 13 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 532.
,, 35 See on this Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 170, 367, 368.
254 12 So said his followers in general. Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 251.
255 4 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 300. For the sinister interpretations placed on the action of Halifax, see his *Life, in loco.*
,, 22 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 302.
256 11 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 799.
,, 31 [Hickes] *Some Discourses*, pp. 25, 80; Burnet's *Reflections* [upon Hickes], pp. 128–30, 160–1.
,, 39 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 799. [This does not appear in the Memoirs, and was clearly inserted to refute the charges of Hickes.]
257 35 See the curious coincidence between the passage and Hoffman's despatch. Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 296.
258 22 Paper printed in Henry Sydney's *Diary*, II. 281–8.
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 495.
,, 33 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XIV., *App.* IX. 456.
259 22 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 496.
260 15 *Ibid.* pp. 535–6.
,, 20 *Ibid.* p. 496.
,, 29 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36707, f. 54, Dec. 27.
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 311.
261 18 Printed in Henry Sydney's *Diary*, II. 288–291.
262 34 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IV. 245, 369–70.
264 4 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 817–9.
,, 12 *Ibid.* pp. 819–20.
,, 19 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 308–10. For an extraordinary perversion of the story see [Hickes], *Some Discourses*, p. 12. Mary subsequently expressed her approval; *Supp.* loc. cit.
,, 33 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 825, with nn. See for this also Mary's *Memoirs*, ed. Doebner, p. 11. Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 103 has a curious reference to the episode.

CHAPTER VIII.

265 4 Luttrell's *Diary*, I. 497, 503.
,, 9 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 496–7.
,, 10 *Life* [by his son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 696.
,, 14 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 496–7; *Life* of Halifax, II. 216.
,, 23 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 326; *Life* [by his son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 696. The date was about March 5; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XII., *App.* VIII. 36. For a ludicrous story and its refutation see Cockburn, *Specimen*, p. 73 (misprinted 65), and its refutation by the author of a *Vindication of...Burnet from the calumnies of...Cockburn*, p. 13.
266 7 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 496. See Cunningham's reference [*Hist.* I. 103] to Burnet's attempted interference with William on a similar point.
,, 16 *Life* of Halifax, II. 216, 222, 229, 232; and cf. Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 103.
,, 19 Krämes, *Maria II Stuart*, p. 214 n.
,, 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 326–7, 497–8.
267 6 Bodl. MSS. Tanner, XXVII. 3.
,, 11 March 31.
,, 14 Luttrell's *Diary*, I. 516.
,, 17 The text is 2 Tim. i. 6. It is therefore the sermon which Letsome [*Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 366] erroneously ascribed to Burnet himself!
,, 21 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* 1901 (Salisbury Cathedral MSS.), p. 381.
268 3 Fox Bourne, *Life* of Locke, II. 156.
,, 10 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 505–6.
,, 12 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 710.

PAGE LINE

268 24 See the very pardonable sneer of Swift in the *Project for the Advancement of Religion* [1709], Scott's ed. of his works, VIII. 95.

269 2 *Biog. Brit.* [Kippis 1778–93, 2nd ed.] III. 35; Hickes in Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, f. 31.

" 10 *Life* of Halifax, II. 206.

" 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 314.

270 7 *Ibid.*

" 21 *Cal. State Pap. Dom. Will. and Mary*, I. 245–6.

" 30 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 16–17.

" 38 *Hist. Own Time*, Airy's ed. II. 398–9 [fol. pag., I. 569–70]; *Supp.* pp. 119–23; Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858 [8 vols.], v. 2, quoting *London Gazette*, July 31, August 4, August 7, 1690. This evidence disposes of the Jacobite legends in Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XLV. 22, 41.

" last line. Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858 [8 vols.], v. 8–16.

271 3 *Life* [by Burnet's son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 700–5.

" 7 *Notes on the Phœnix edition of the Pastoral Letter*, p. 88.

" 13 Supposing, that is, that he was really the author of the *Character* printed in the *Life* [appended *Hist. Own Time*, fol. pag. II. 725–6].

" 21 For all this, see *Life* of Halifax, II. 193–5, 198 n. 3, 529–31; Dartmouth, notes on *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 267, II. 726.

" 36 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 327.

272 20 For all this see *ibid.* p. 316.

" 39 *Ibid.* p. 327.

273 1 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 9–10; Bodl. MSS. Ballard XLV. 44 [undated letter of April 18].

" 12 Bodl. MSS. Ballard XXI. 13 [April 23, 1689].

" 19 *Ibid.* XLV. 24.

" 31 Lady Russell's *Letters*, ed. Sellwood, 7th ed., p. 219.

" 40 See the pref. to the reissue of 1693.

274 3 See on this Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 373, ff. 172 and 38; D. 836, f. 148; D. 1232, f. 15. Also the *Life* of James II [ed. Clarke], II. pp. 316–8; one of the few allusions to Burnet contained in that work.

" 15 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 10–11; *Supp.* pp. 317–8.

" 18 Bodl. MSS. Ballard XLV. 13.

" 22 On this see Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], IV. 98–102.

" 34 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 498.

275 9 Reresby's *Memoirs*, ed. 1875, pp. 454–5.

" 15 *Memoirs* of Mary II, ed. Doebner, p. 14.

" 29 "In tanto rerum tumultu quo jam pene obruimur non facile est cuivis semet "quoties oportet compellare [*sic*] ne dixerim cum amicis colloqui....Gaudeo "quod conatus mei pro pace Ecclesiastica et pro temperanda subscrip- "tionum tirranide tibi probentur. Sæpius miratus sum qua fronte "Ecclesiæ Reformatæ quibus Infallibilitas Ecclesiæ videtur exosa ab "omnibus Ecclesiæ addictis exigant eas formulas subscriptionum quibus "teneatur cuivis propositioni quæ in Confessione Fidei locum nacta sit "assentiri, cum non facile sit homini ingenuo qui pacem religiose colere "statuerit eo non obstante sistema integrum uno haustu deglutire. Et si "ulla umquam spes pacis inter Ecclesias conciliandæ affulgeat hac methodo "procedendum, non ut omnes idem sentiant, quod nec sperandum est, sed ut "omnes pacifice vivant etiam cum aliter sentientibus. Libertas Conscientiæ "est jam inter nos lege sancita. Sed quod articulos pacis cum Non- "Conformistis ut vocantur attinet, licet negotium hoc fuerit in Camera "Superiori ante quosdam menses confectum hæret tamen in Camera "Inferiori nec ut videtur, hac sessione expedietur. Nam id accidet quod "non est infrequens ut cum Nonconformistæ majora sperantes sponte oblata "temnerent Rigidiores ex Conformistis articulos æque laxiores crederent. "Sed speramus Negotium melius in hieme conficiendum. Quod Ponte- "ficios" [Papists] "attinet moderamen [?moderatio] nostræ religionis et "regis clementissimi numquam est satis prædicandum nam securi "vivant etiam authores cons.'iorum sub rege Jacobo. Et si quandoque "suspitionis causa in carcerem mittantur hoc eo moderamine fit ut pateat "eorum rem agi, nam furori Publico quem in se concitarunt et etiam num "concitant hoc pacto substrahuntur et servantur."

PAGE LINE

276 24 The original (London, 24 July, 1689) is in the Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. c.—R. K. It was received August 15. A copy will be found in the Bodleian Library, MSS. Eng. th. c. 23.

,, 29 Birch's *Life* of Tillotson, 2nd ed. p. 165.

,, 37 See also *State Pap. Dom. Will. and Mary*, I. 262 for Nottingham's circular letter.

277 12 Plumptre's *Life* of Ken, II. 47.

,, 20 For all that follows see the rare blue-book, *Alterations in the book of Common Prayer prepared by the Royal Commission for the revision of the Liturgy in* 1689 *ordered by the House of Commons to be printed* 2 *June*, 1854. (It is cited by Macaulay, *in loco*.)

,, 39 *Ibid.* p. 106.

278 1 *Ibid.* pp. 15, 99, 107.

,, 12 He means of course that the clause concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost, cannot, in its present form, date as far back as the Council of Nicæa, or the period of Athanasius.

,, 30 *Ibid.* pp. 47, 20.

281 10 In *Some Sermons preached on Several Occasions; and an Essay towards a New Book of Homilies...prepared at the desire of Archbishop Tillotson, and some Bishops By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum*, 1713. The preface gives the history of the attempt.

,, 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 327; see also *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 26.

,, 34 See *supra*, p. 244.

,, 36 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 23.

,, 37 *Ibid.* p. 26.

,, 39 He had married a niece of Lady Margaret Burnet.

,, 40 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 22, 25.

282 2 Cf. Wodrow, *Hist.* IV. 436, with *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 23; *Supp.* p. 327.

,, 5 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 540–44. Dalrymple had been recommended by Fagel, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 24.

,, 11 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 327–9; and cf. [Hickes] *Some Discourses*, pp. 66–8, Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, f. 27.

,, 22 Bodl. MSS. Ballard XXII. 29 (Nov. 21, 1689).

,, 40 See Cunningham's sarcastic attribution of the entire project to Burnet. "At this time Dr Burnet...endeavoured to bring all the different sects... "of Christians into an union and agreement with him." *Hist.* I. 118.

283 15 All this from Lathbury's *Hist. of the Convocation of the Church of England*, ed. 2, London, 1853, p. 331; quoting Calamy I. 463; *Vox Cleri*, pp. 68–9. See also *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 33–4; *Supp.* p. 333.

,, 21 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 33–4.

284 6 Letter to Sir W. Dutton Colt, printed by Ralph, and quoted from him in a n. to *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833 [fol. pag.], II. 295.

285 7 On this see Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], V. 182.

,, 30 For all this see *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 341–2, which compare with *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 43–5; where the passage quoted in the text is much modified. For Burnet's confusion between the two bills see Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], V. 205 n.

,, last line. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 42–3.

286 11 *Ibid.* pp. 37–8; *Supp.* pp. 335–6. This episode cannot have improved the relations between Burnet and the Dutch favourite, which seems never to have been very friendly. [Cf. *Supp.* p. 197 with *ibid.* p. 496; and see *Ibid.* p. xix and *App.* VI.]

,, 14 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 47; *Supp.* p. 343.

,, 22 *Memoirs* of Mary II, ed. Doebner, p. 21.

,, 30 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 46.

,, 35 Cf. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 55; and *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 710.

,, 39 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 55.

288 last line. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 537–40, and cf. with *ibid.* p. 497.

289 6 *Ibid.* p. 504.

,, 9 *Ibid.* p. 330.

PAGE LINE

289 28 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 725–6; for the question of authorship see *Life* of Halifax, II. 529–30.
290 2 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 498–9.
,, 9 Bodl. MSS. Tanner, XXV. f. 170.
,, 15 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 499.
,, 31 *Ibid.* pp. 329–30. See also Geo. Hearne to Thomas Hearne, Aug. 3, 1712. [Bodl. MSS. Rawl. Letters, 28, f. 105b.]
291 7 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 499–500.
,, 10 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 707.
,, 15 *Ibid. supra.*
,, 18 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 330.
,, 21 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 707 n.
,, 22 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 330.
,, 26 *Ibid.* p. 499.
,, 36 *Ibid.* p. 502.
292 12 *Ibid.* p. 330.
,, 17 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 708. For the analogous "Lambert" case see the *Discourses* [of Hickes], pp. 9–10; Burnet's *Reflections* [on the same], pp. 15–22; Hickes's unpublished retort Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, ff. 7–10.
,, 30 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 500.
,, 35 *Ibid.* p. 329.
293 15 *Ibid.* p. 501.
,, 20 *Ibid.* p. 500.
,, 30 For *Allix* see *St. Pap. Dom. W. and M.*, I. 245, *Dict. Nat. Biog.* art. Allix; for *Bentley*, Burnet's letter to Godolphin, *infra*, p. 419; for *Colbatch*, *Dict. Nat. Biog.* art. Colbatch, and *infra*, p. 428; for *Craig*, *Dict. Nat. Biog.*; for *Geddes*, *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, Birch, *Life* of Tillotson, 2nd ed. p. 307; for *Wotton*, *Dict. Nat. Biog.* art. Wotton, Birch's *Tillotson*, 2nd ed. pp. 304–6; for *Tanner*, Bodl. MSS. Tanner, XXIV. f. 59, XXV. f. 170.
,, 33 *Injunctions for the Archdeacons of the Diocese of Sarum*...1690, p. 3; *Pastoral Care*, 4th ed. pp. 185–7.
,, 40 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 331.
294 4 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 707.
,, 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 503.
,, 14 The correspondence followed on Dr Finch's failure to appear at the Bishop's Visitation. It took place in Oct. 1698 and will be found in Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 63–4.
,, 32 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 504; *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 712; Stillingfleet's *Discourse on bonds of resignation*, dated July 10, 1695, and published 1695; Whiston's *Memoirs*, pp. 41–2; Burnet's *Pastoral Care*, 4th ed. pp. 242–4.
,, 35 See a curious letter from Burnet to Lord Commissioner Trevor (19 Sept. [1706?]). It concerns a vacancy at "The Devizes." This was apparently a living in the Lord Chancellor's gift, of the annual value of £12. Burnet had been there, and had induced the parish to raise this to £80, to which Burnet himself proposed to add £20 a year. This, however, was conditional on all parties to the agreement approving of the actual presentee (Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 18, XX. (copy); from Bodl. MSS. Hearne, *Diaries*, lxxiii. 39).
,, last line. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 501.
295 5 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 709–10.
,, 8 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 501.
,, 13 *Injunctions for the Archdeacons of the Diocese of Sarum*...1690...p. 3.
,, 16 King's *Anecdotes*, p. 185. "I knew," he adds, "Bishop Burnet of Salisbury. "He was a furious party man, and easily imposed on by any lying spirit "of his own faction; but he was a better pastor than any man...now "[1760]...on the Bishops' Bench."
,, 21 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 387, 505, 510; *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 722–4.
,, 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 500.
,, 35 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 723.
,, 38 *Ibid.*

PAGE LINE

295 39 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 723.
296 1 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 500.
,, 6 Strype's *Stow*, ed. 1720, Bk v. p. 46.
,, 11 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 500.
,, 13 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 723.
,, 24 He seems to have been almost as inveterate a tea-drinker as Johnson. Hawkins mentions a tradition that he drank sixteen large cups every morning. [Leslie Stephen's *Johnson*, Eng. Men of Let. Ser., p. 55.]
,, 31 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II, 721.
,, 39 *Ibid.* p. 722; *N. and Q.*, ser. II., VIII. 138; ser. V., III. 168, 213, 339.
297 12 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772, f. 136, Nov. 13, 1716 [to G. Duckett].
,, 19 *Life* as above, p. 722. See also Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36707, f. 68. Aug. 6, 1689: "The King goes on with his building at Kensington, "and Burnet with his at Salisbury."
,, 21 "I doubt if he did much or anything to the Palace, great alterations having "been made a little before his time." Letter from A. R. Malden, Esq., Diocesan Registry, The Close, Salisbury, 29 June, 1906.
,, 22 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, f. 59.
298 5 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 505. For Cunningham's malicious account of Burnet's episcopate, see *Hist.* I. 124. We understand the satiric allusion to his reforming zeal, to his patronage of Spanheim and Craig, but it is impossible to grasp what Cunningham means when he alleges that Burnet introduced into his diocese Highland superstitions, "dreams, "divinations, presages, second-sighted visions and prodigies." But it is clear he took considerable interest in the "occult." See *supra*, pp. 47, 172; and *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* V. 384 (he investigated a supposed "miraculous" recovery from illness). For Trelawny, Bishop of Exeter's sneers, see Bodl. MSS. Ballard, IX. no. 38.
,, 12 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 503.
,, 28 *Ibid.* pp. 330–1; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 638, 640–1, 645–6.
299 23 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 501–2.
,, 27 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 711–2.
,, 31 See for instance Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XX. 22; *ibid.* Tanner, XXI. 17; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. Portland MSS.*, IV. 463; *ibid.* V. 388–9.
300 5 See *infra*, p. 419.
,, 14 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 349.
,, 16 *Cal. St. Pap. Dom. Will. and Mary*, II. 158; Nov. 6, 1690.
,, 18 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* III. 420.
301 3 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34095, f. 160. The letter is long, and gives a valuable account of the general political situation.
,, 8 See also Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XXVII. 41; Dec. 24, 1689.
,, 20 Burnet's *Reflections* [upon Hickes], pp. 62–3.
302 5 Letter of July 24, 1689 ("recepta," writes Van Limborch, "15 Augusti") Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19 c.—R. K. A copy will be found in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23.
,, 15 Burnet's *Reflections* [upon Hickes], pp. 145–6.
303 13 These letters will be found in Plumptre's *Life* of Ken, II. 46–9.
,, 26 Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], pp. 102–5.
304 28 For this episode see *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XIII., *App.* VI. 29; Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 55; [Hickes'] *Some Discourses*, p. 15 and *App.* I.; Burnet's *Reflections* [on the same], pp. 63–6; Hickes' MSS. retort (Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841), f. 27; *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 710–11; *A letter to Thomas Burnet Esq....* [ascribed to Philip Beach], London, 1736; *Some Remarks on a late Letter to Thomas Burnet Esq. said to be written by a son of Dr Beach...* [signed J. Sinclair], London, 1736; and *A second Letter to Thomas Burnet Esq....by the Author of the first letter...* [signed Phil. Beach], London, 1736. Burnet, in his *Reflections* on Hickes is mistaken in saying that he himself obtained the *Nolle Prosequi*. He declined a second intervention.
305 15 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 359–60.
,, 24 Bodl. MSS. Hearne, Diary, June 30, 1708 (XVII. 73), quoting [Ferguson's] *Large Review of the Summary View*, p. iii.

PAGE LINE

305 28 See the sarcastic comments of Hickes Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, f. 28.

,, 36 See *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* I. 113 (Hamilton Palace MSS.). Search was courteously made at Hamilton Palace in the year 1903, for this and other Burnet MSS., but they could not be found. The abstractor in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* I. makes Burnet express special regret, since he had himself *advised* the establishment of Presbytery. This is clearly a mis-reading (see *supra*, pp. 281–2, and Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], p. 114). A story to the effect that he advised Hamilton to be firm to the Presbyterian interest will be found in *Some Discourses* [by Hickes], pp. 66–7; and their continuation, Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, f. 27.

306 1 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34095, f. 161.

,, 7 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 357. Cf. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 75.

,, 9 *Cal. St. Pap. Dom. Will. and Mary*, III. 1691–2, p. 48.

,, 11 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XLV. f. 48 [30 April, 1691].

,, 36 For all this see *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 540–3, and compare *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 74 with *Supp.* p. 357. But it should be observed in addition that Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36662, f. 280 (letter from Johnston, Berlin, Jan. 27 [1691–2]) shows that he was not at that date aware of the nature of the employment for which he was being recalled. He speaks of himself as leaving Berlin within the week; and he cannot therefore have reached England till *after* the massacre had taken place.

307 19 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 373.

,, 21 *Ibid.* p. 536; and see also language used in pp. 291–2.

,, 27 *Ibid.* pp. 291–2.

308 6 *Ibid.* pp. 373–4. On this see Macaulay's comments. Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VI. 25–9, gives an excellent summary of the affair.

309 30 *Memoirs* of Mary II, ed. Doebner, p. 43.

,, 32 *New Pref.* inserted before the *Discourse of the Pastoral Care* in the edition of 1713.

310 9 Dated March 29, 1692, Birch's *Tillotson*, 2nd ed. p. 264.

,, 22 *Ibid.* p. 266. Letter dated Ap. 12, 1692.

314 10 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 506.

,, 17 Luttrell's *Diary*, II. 334 [Jan. 12, 1691–2] mentions that the Bishops in town have petitioned the king for a proclamation. See also the actual proclamation of Jan. 21, 1692; Dartmouth, n. to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 101 (he is mistaken as to the date).

,, 19 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 386–7.

315 22 Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19 d.—R. K. 2 (Feb. 12 [1692–3]). A copy is in MSS. Eng. th. c. 23.

,, last line. *Ibid.* M. 19 e.—R. K. 3 (Westminster, Nov. 10, O. S. 1693) "Recepta "28 Novem. St. N." (note by Van Limborch). For a copy see previous note.

316 28 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 42.

,, 31 The measure is described *ibid.* pp. 105–6.

,, last line. *Ibid.* pp. 106–7.

317 5 Swift, *Works* (2nd ed. Scott), V. 103; Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], VI. 335.

,, 8 Macaulay, *op. cit.* pp. 360–9.

,, 26 *Ibid.* pp. 369–71; *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 387–8. The debates took place on Saturday, Jan. 21, and Monday, Jan. 23, 1692–3.

,, 31 Bodl. MSS. Tanner, XXV. f. 1 (North to Sancroft, Jan. 30 [16]92[–3]).

,, 35 Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 145. His account of the affair must be taken as usual *cum grano*; Burnet cannot have proposed to *absolve* his Peers at the last.

,, 37 See n. to l. 31.

,, 40 See what Macaulay aptly calls that "strange" pamphlet by Samuel Johnson (the author of *Julian the Apostate*, and previously Lord Russell's chaplain) *Notes upon the Phœnix edition of the Pastoral Letter* (London, 1694). It is probable that Johnson had been originally exasperated by the attitude of Burnet in 1683, as he had answered Tillotson's letter to Russell (see *Letters* of Lady Russell, ed. Sellwood, 7th ed., pp., 236–50); for further causes of ill-feeling see *supra*, pp. 91–97. Calamy, *Historical account of my own Life*, London, 1829, I. 94, mentions the rumour, that Burnet in his *History* ignored Johnson's sufferings out of pique at the above mentioned pamphlet.

PAGE LINE

318 1 Bodl. MSS. Tanner, XXV. f. 42 (May 7 [16]93).
,, 3 *Ibid.* f. 1; and the edition in question.
,, 5 Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], VI. 372; and Burnet, *Hist. Own Time*, [fol. pag.], II. 118.
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 387–8 *passim*.
,, 30 *Ibid.* p. 382.
,, 34 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 712.
,, 37 See *State Trials*, XIII. 879 for the statement as to Queen Mary.
,, 39 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 372. In *ibid.* p. 542 last line, p. 543 ll. 1–6, the present writer has fallen into a confusion between the summers of 1692 and 1693. The sentence should run: "Rumours were certainly current in "London, as well as Edinburgh, within the month; but they do not seem to "have been very menacing when in the summer of 1692 Johnston went "down to investigate the situation (see above, pp. 391–2) as the massacre is "not mentioned among specific causes of discontent. But when, during "the next year, on the eve of the campaign, these rumours became im- "portunate, Johnston, who was again sent down, as representative of White- "hall, to manage the Session, seems to have received instructions from "the king, presumably at Mary's instance, to investigate the matter. (See "above, pp. 372–3, 392). The inquiry seems to have been conducted with "discretion. The extremely quiet and satisfactory character of the Session" [etc., etc.].
319 8 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 120–2; *Supp.* pp. 392–3; Birch's *Tillotson*, 2nd ed. pp. 281–6.
,, 18 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 379, 393–4.
,, 29 See Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], VII. 62–70; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VI. 246.
,, 38 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 395.
320 12 *Ibid.*
,, 28 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 126–7; *Supp.* pp. 396–7.
324 28 5 Eliz. c. 5; 27 Eliz. c. 11; 35 Eliz. c. 7, § 22. The last two acts were formally repealed in 1863, the first not till 1869. See Hallam, *Const. Hist.* ed. 1850, I. 397–8 n.; and the *Chronological Table and Index to the Statutes*, 11th ed. pp. 52–6.
325 13 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 507. It has been suggested by Blackburne, probably with some truth, that Burnet's own views on subscription (see *supra*, pp. 214, 275–6, 365) rendered the task in certain respects uncongenial (*Confessional*, pp. 82–151).
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 506.
,, 29 *Ibid.* p. 326.
,, 40 *Œuvres de Bossuet*, ed. 1841, XI. 336–453; more especially pp. 396–8; 423–4; 435–7; 448–50.
326 37 Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19 f.—R. K.; dated 18 Nov. 1694. A copy is among Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23.
327 7 Can there have been a personal grudge? See *Cal. St. Pap. Dom. Will. and Mary*, 1693, p. 123 (Burnet and others to peruse Leslie's papers with a view to an answer by the Bishop of Londonderry).
,, 27 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 506–7.
,, last line. See Birch's *Tillotson*, 2nd ed. pp. 303–4 (letter from Tillotson, June 28, 1694); *Remarks* (on that Life) (ascribed to George Smith, non-juror Bishop), 1st ed. pp. 86–8; Burnet's *Reflections* [on Hickes], pp. 22–5; Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 841, ff. 49–50; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 8.
328 14 Birch's *Tillotson*, ed. II. pp. 307–12. It includes letters from Burnet under date Aug. 31 and Sept. 10.
,, 28 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 507; *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 719.
,, 38 Oldmixon, *Hist. of England* [during reigns of William and Mary, Anne and George I], p. 95.
329 17 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 136.
,, 39 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 405.
330 6 *Ibid.* pp. 390–1.
,, 9 *Ibid.* p. 390.
,, 19 Burnet's *Essay on the Late Queen*, pp. 108, 138.

PAGE LINE

330 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 405; and the MS. original.
331 2 *Ibid.*
,, 8 *Ibid.*

CHAPTER IX.

332 11 *Ibid.* p. 406.
,, 23 *Ibid.* The Commissioners were sworn in April 30. Luttrell's *Diary*, III. 466.
,, last line. Patent Rolls 7 William III, Part 3, Dors. no. 6, Roll no. 3380. Considerable difficulty arose in defining the exact scope of the Commission, owing to "the fact that the Letters Patent *do not clearly and accurately* express the "*purport* of the Commission—a most unusual thing!" (letter of Oct. 24, 1906, from Mr Salisbury, of the Record Office, who courteously devoted some time to the study of the point, and whose definition, drawn from the docket in the Signet Office Docket Book, coincides with that of Burnet's own son in the *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 715–16.
333 12 *The Bishop of Salisbury's Speech...upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity*, p. 4.
,, 18 Cunningham, *Hist.* I. 146.
,, 20 *Hatton Correspondence*, II. 215–16; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 149–50; *Supp.* pp. 407–8.
,, 26 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 22908, ff. 25^{b}.
334 35 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, LXX. 64.
335 28 See the remarks of T. Wharton Jones, *Life and Death of William Bedell* [Camden Society], pp. 105, 123, 126, 138–9, 219.
336 21 For all this see Onno Klopp's *Correspondence de Leibnitz avec l'Électrice...* I. and II. (Introduction and letters, *passim*); also his *Fall d. H. Stuart*, *passim*.
,, 27 *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 697–8.
338 11 This letter is in the Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS., Burnet bundle, Nos. 3–4. It is not clear whether the date is that of despatch or reception as it appears to be given in the endorsement.
,, 30 Burnet's account of this affair (*Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 156–8 and *Supp.* pp. 410–12) is not, as Mr Clarke courteously points out, altogether accurate. The statement in the text has been revised by Mr Clarke, who quotes Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland* (1882), II. 196–7; *Acts of the General Assembly* (ed. 1843), p. 243; *Acts of Scottish Parliament, William and Mary*, Part i., Sess. v., Acts 23 and 27; Defoe's *Memorials of the Church of Scotland*, p. 345.
339 2 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 410–11.
,, 13 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 163–4.
,, 21 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 414–5. The corresponding passage in the *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 161–2 has been a good deal altered. See for this *infra*, p. 387.
,, 31 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VII. 154–202.
,, 34 Kemble, *State Papers*, pp. 184–6; see also p. 187.
340 16 *Vernon Corres.*, I. 69; Cobbett, *Parl. Hist., in loco.*
,, 25 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 462–4; *Supp.* pp. 101–2.
,, 34 An enactment passed in the preceding session, which obliged all peers to be summoned when the *trial* of a peer took place. This Burnet had opposed, fearing the loss of the Treasons Bill, to which it was appended. See Dartmouth's sarcasm on the point, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 161 and note.
,, 40 For Burnet, see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 193; for Tenison, see his *Memoirs*, 3rd ed. pp. 61–3.
341 1 *Vernon Corres.*, I. 133.
,, 15 For all this see Macaulay, *Hist. in loco* (especially VII. pp. 381–5, ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.]); Dartmouth and Hardwicke's notes to Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 181–93 (one of these annotators writes from the Tory,

PAGE LINE

the other from the Whig, standpoint); and Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VII. 304–12. On p. 311 he quotes the remarkable language of the Imperial representative; "Count Auersperg," he says, "objected to "certain Englishmen, that in the framing of such a Bill the King and "Parliament acted more despotically than could any Government on the "Continent."

341 18 See Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], VII. 391–2 on the raising of the previous question (Dec. 8).

,, 22 See *supra*, p. 64.

,, 25 See Nichol's *Illustrations of...Literary History*...III. 253–4.

,, 36 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 102 and n.

,, 37 See Dartmouth's n. to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 182.

,, 38 See *supra*, p. 228; and cf. with *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 716.

,, last line. *Vernon Corres.*, I. 89.

342 6 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 185–9.

,, 27 See *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 193; the letter is printed in the *Life* appended to the same II. 700; the original will be found in Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 57.

343 19 For this episode see *L. J.* XVI. 79; *Vernon Corres.*, I. 178–9; Dartmouth's long n. to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 193.

,, 24 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 193.

,, 39 See Bibliography *infra*; and *Vernon Corres.*, I. 202, 228 (Feb. 9, May 4, 1697).

344 6 From a curious observation in *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 205, we may conjecture that William expressed dislike of the sermon. It is strange that Burnet, who so clearly saw the folly of French excess in this direction, should have so greatly offended.

345 24 For all this see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 369–71; *Life* [by son] appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 712–15, where the two memorials are printed. This version, however, has been collated with the originals, which will be found in Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 112, 115, with the result of proving that the editor, though professing to quote from the MS., has entirely recast the style. We give of course the MS. reading.

346 3 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 205–7.

,, 13 Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], VIII. 48; *L. J.* XVI. 235 (March 15).

,, 17 In his essay on Berkeley.

,, 18 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 211–14.

,, 21 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VIII. 196, 200.

,, 23 *Statutes of the Realm*, 9 Will. III, cap. XXXV. The course of the proceedings can be traced in *L. J.* XVI. 217^b, 218^b, 220^a; *C. J.*, Feb. 26, March 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15, 21, 23, 24, 30; *L. J.* XVI. 252^b, 254^b, 255^b, 262^b, 267^a, 271^a, 274^b; *C. J.*, May 6, 14, 18, 21, 24, June 1; *L. J.* XVI. 296^a, 298^a, 306^a, 348^a. The initial attempt came from the Lords; the Bill which became law originated with the Commons. The amending Act is 53 George III, cap. 160, § 2.

347 29 Remonstrant's Library M. 19 i.—R. K.; a copy will be found among Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23.

348 14 *Ibid.* M. 19 k.—R. K. [undated, but must belong to autumn of 1698]. For a copy, see preceding note. For Burnet's continued interest in the Trinitarian controversy, see Nicolson's *Letters*, pp. 126, 129, 131.

,, 25 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VIII. 98–99.

,, 28 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 221.

,, 31 Klopp, as above.

349 4 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 10.

,, 19 *Ibid.*

,, 24 *Ibid.* f. 12 (April 5).

,, 37 Hanover Royal Library, Leibnitz MSS., Burnet bundle, No. 22.

350 3 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 12.

,, 26 *Ibid.*

,, 38 Lord Wolseley's *Marlborough*, II. 339 (April $\frac{1}{12}$, 1698).

PAGE LINE

351 7 For Dartmouth's ill-natured explanation that Burnet was angry because he could not secure the reversion of Winchester, and that the preceptorship was a *solatium*, see his note to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 211.

,, 9 *Ibid.*

,, 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 493–4. See also *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 210.

352 3 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 210–11.

,, 21 *Ibid.* p. 211 and note.

,, 24 Luttrell's *Diary*, IV. 393 [June 18, 1698].

,, 33 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 493. One son is buried in Salisbury Cathedral. "March 21, 1696. A young son of the Rt Reverend Gilbert, Lord Bishop "of Sarum, newly born, died and was buried the 21st." (Cathedral Registers.)

,, 36 Luttrell's *Diary*, VI. 177.

,, 39 Circular letter to her relations, Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 77–8. Her second son, Gilbert, a child of seven, seems to have gone with her to Holland. *Ibid.* ff. 80, 173.

353 9 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509.

,, 13 *Ibid.* p. 493.

,, 16 Circular letter as above.

,, 18 *Vernon Corres.*, II. 124.

,, 23 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 492–3.

354 4 These letters will be found in *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 716–18.

,, 16 *Ibid.* p. 718; from the account of the interview given by a dependant of the Bishop, who had it from him at the time.

,, 19 *Ibid.* p. 723; *Hist. Own Time*, II. 237 note.

,, 29 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 1172, f. 2 (copy), dated Abingdon, Oct. 13, 1698.

355 20 Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19 k.—R. K. The letter is undated, but must belong to the beginning of 1699, N.S. It has been already quoted *supra*, p. 347; for a copy see note *loc. cit.*

,, 25 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 211, 245–6.

,, 40 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 5716, f. 30.

356 4 *N. and Q.*, Series I., IX. 448.

,, 11 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 718.

,, 13 See Dartmouth's n. *Hist. Own Time*, p. 630.

,, 17 Cf. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 90–92, with the original version in *Supp.* pp. 373–4.

,, 21 See *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 312–3.

357 11 The verses will be found in *A New Collection of Poems relating to State Affairs*...London, 1705, p. 532, the same ed. 1716, III. 334, and elsewhere. The title is *A New Ballad called, The Brawny Bishop's Complaint. To the tune of Packington's Poems.*

,, 16 *Supp. Hist. Own Time.*

,, 23 Chesterfield's *Letters to his Son*, ed. Strachey, 1901, I. 294. See also the remarkable testimony of Gosling in Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XIV. 163.

358 5 *The...Diary of William, first Earl Cowper, Lord Chancellor* [Roxburgh Club], Eton, 1833, p. 30, Dec. 31, 1706.

,, 11 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. xix–xx; 373–4.

,, 20 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 218–21.

,, 32 See Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, 2nd ed., pp. 67–71, 633, 835, 878–9, 1061, 1256; and Burnet, *Hist. Own Time*, II. 226–7, 250–1.

,, 38 Dartmouth's nn. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 227, 251.

359 6 *Ibid.*; and Burnet's own account of the affair, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 226–7.

,, 14 Locke is not once mentioned in Burnet's *Hist. Own Time*; and see *supra*, pp. 228, 267, 270. But see *Works* of Catherine Cockburn, pp. xv–xviii.

,, 37 Fox Bourne's *Life* of Locke, II. 416, 437; the date must be 1698 or 1699 since by 1700 Stillingfleet was dead. The original is in the Remonstrant's Library, but the copyist employed by the present writer could not identify it.

,, 40 Leibnitz to Burnet of Kenmay, $\frac{28}{30}$ Jan., 1699. Leibnitz, *Philosophischen Schriften* (ed. Gerhardt), 1875–87, III. pp. 249–50.

PAGE LINE

360 7 Merz, *Life* of Leibnitz, p. 127.
,, 25 See Leibnitz, *Opera Omnia* (ed. Dutens), VI. 273, 287.
,, 38 For all this see Klopp's *Corres. de Leib. av. l'Électrice Sophie* and his *Fall d. H. Stuart, passim*, especially III. 90–8, VI. 15–18, 49, 229–36.
361 1 Leibnitz to Burnet, $\frac{6}{16}$ May, $\frac{18}{28}$ May, 1697; 5 April, 1698; Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS. [Burnet bundle], 15–18, 22. Copy in Bodleian.
,, 11 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VII. 460–83.
,, 14 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VI. 230, etc.; IX. 365–70 [Aug., 1698].
,, 19 Printed in Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Électrice*...II. 100–5.
364 18 Hanover Royal Library, Leibnitz MSS. i. vol. XII. no. 4, bl. 4. We note that Burnet, here as often elsewhere, dates after the Scotch fashion; the diurnal date being in accordance with the Old Style, the annual with the New. The date is really either 17 Feb., 1698 O.S., or 27 Feb., 1699 N.S.
,, 32 Cf. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 507, with *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 227–8.
365 14 See *supra*, p. 325, l. 13, note.
,, 24 *Remarks on the Examination of the Exposition of the Second Article of our Church.* By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum, p. 2.
,, 36 *Exposition*, ed. 3, pp. vi–x, 108–121.
366 7 *Ibid.* p. vi. (For an excellent passage on the influence of Augustine, see Burnet's *Pref.* to the *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, pp. 32–5.)
,, 15 *Ibid.* p. 107.
,, 18 *Ibid.* p. 109.
,, 20 *Ibid.* p. 110.
,, 24 *Ibid.* p. 171.
,, 26 *Ibid.* p. 220.
,, 28 *Ibid.* p. 219.
,, 33 *Ibid.* pp. 224–6.
,, 38 *Ibid.* pp. 274–80.
367 21 *Ibid.* pp. 266–70, 302, 317–8, 823–4, 339.
,, 33 *Ibid.* pp. 356–62.
368 6 It is printed in Klopp. *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Électrice*...II. 247–9; see also an appendix to *A Memorial...to the Princess Sophia*, p. 115.
,, 10 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 506.
,, 13 Noble's *Biog. Hist. Eng.*, p. 182.
,, 26 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 506–7.
,, 38 Nicolson's *Letters*, I. 195 n. He died in 1711.
370 3 Bodl. MSS. D. 23, f. 26.
,, 13 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. ix, x, 545–6.
371 2 From a *French* translation in *A Memorial...to the Princess Sophia*, p. 100, and in Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Électrice*...II. 146. It is dated in the Scotch fashion, Feb. 27 O.S., 1700 [*i.e.* Feb. 27/March 8, 1699–1700].
,, 17 On all this see Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 228; Evelyn, *Diary*, 24 April, 1700; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VI. 20, 22; VII. 133–8, 470–8; VIII. 208–12, 443–4.
,, 33 For this Bill, which was brought up from the Commons, March 14, and received the Royal Assent April 11, 1700, see Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 228–9; Lecky, *Hist. of England*, ed. 1883–90, I. 275; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VIII. 443–8.
,, 39 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 229. See also on the whole question *supra*, p. 169; and the *Pref.* to *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, pp. 28–9, 37–41, 46–52.
,, footnote. See Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XI. 351–2.
372 5 *Ibid.* p. 440.
,, 11 *Ibid.* p. 229.
,, 22 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34095, f. 161.
,, 25 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 360–2.
373 39 For this affair see *Vernon Corres.*, III. 19–25; Burnet (with Dartmouth's nn.), Macaulay, and Klopp, *in loco.*
374 23 Macaulay, *Hist.* ed. 1858, etc. [8 vols.], VIII. 249; Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 237.
,, 32 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, X. No. 18 (or f. 40).

PAGE LINE

375 16 Lambeth MSS. 942, Nos. 157–161. For Burnet's character of Jersey, see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 381.

,, 35 Lambeth MSS. 942, No. 159. There is an incorrect copy in Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 4292, f. 34^{b}–5.

376 10 Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, pp. 343–9; Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 249–50.

,, 34 Evelyn, *Diary*, March 25, 1700; Bodl. MSS. Ballard, VII. 42 same date.

377 2 For all this see Allen and McClure's *Two Hundred Years of the S.P.C.K.*, especially pp. 7–9; and Strype's edition of Stow's *London* (1720), Book v., p. 30, etc.

,, 17 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 318.

,, 31 See Overton, *Life in the English Church*, 1660–1714; Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 318 and n.; Atterbury, *Epistolary Corres.*, II. 251; Nicolson's *Letters*, I. 145–9.

378 8 Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS., Burnet bundle, 27–8, Sept. 10, 1701, *Latin*. A *French* letter of the same date sent by another hand (*Ibid.* pp. 29–30) is in Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Élec.*, II. 285, and *A Memorial...to the Princess Sophia*, p. 106—more fully in the latter.

,, 19 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 248–9.

,, 21 *Ibid.* pp. 247–8.

,, 22 *Ibid.* p. 216.

,, 23 *Ibid.* p. 215.

,, 28 *Ibid.* pp. 215–6; and Leibnitz, letter of $\frac{8}{16}$ May, 1697, Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS., Burnet bundle, 15–6.

,, 34 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, VII. 43 (March 11 [1699–]1700).

,, last line. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 508–9.

379 16 See Ferguson, *Large Review of the Summary View* [exact reference lost]; Bodl. MSS. Hearne, XVII. 77. Hearne says he heard the original story eight years before 1708. There is a short account of Katherine Tofts in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

,, 25 Bodl. MSS. Hearne, CII. 19. See also Elliott's *Specimen of the Bishop of Sarum's Posthumous History*, p. 32.

,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509.

,, 39 For all this see the posthumous edition of her *Method of Devotion* (Preface); Bodl. MSS. Rawl. C. 983, ff. 109, 111.

380 21 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 1092, ff. 136–7.

,, 31 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509; Bodl. MSS. Ballard, VII. 43; Luttrell, *Diary*, IV. 649; Pref. to the posthumous edition of the *Method of Devotion*; Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 1092, f. 36^{b} [marg. n.]. We have not been able to ascertain the exact date of the marriage or where it took place. The Registers of Salisbury Cathedral and of the Chapels Royal [Somerset House] have been searched in vain. Application to the Registrar of Worcester diocese, and the incumbent of St James', Clerkenwell, evoked no response.

,, last line. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509.

381 4 Overton's *Life in the English Church*, pp. 155, 287.

,, 6 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 1092, ff. 111–203.

,, 17 Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 1092, f. 146.

,, 18 It should be noted that she was a personal friend of Stillingfleet, who had a great respect for her mental powers.

,, 23 *Ibid.* f. 138^{b}. Mr Clarke points out the curious fact that the doctrines of this enthusiast were till very recently among those which ministers of the Church of Scotland were required to renounce at their ordination.

,, 32 See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509.

,, 35 See the Pref. to the posthumous ed. of *Method of Devotion*, p. xxii.

382 5 Several of which are printed in Cox's *Marlborough*.

,, 8 See *An Account of the Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough*, 1742, p. 5.

,, 9 See *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 90-1; and cf. with *Supp.* pp. 373–4.

,, 21 See Luttrell, *Diary*, IV. 675–6, for the funeral. Contemporary opinion exonerated the doctors; see Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VIII. 553.

,, 37 See Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VIII. 558–69.

383 17 For all this Klopp, *in loco*.

PAGE LINE

383 37 See *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 223–4, 232–3, 245, 251–2.

384 14 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IX. 1 etc. He points out that William received the news at Hampton Court. Burnet, by a slip, suggests that he heard it in Holland (*Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 252).

385 15 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 247; 253–4.

,, 24 Klopp, for instance, on the authority of the Austrian representatives, gives the *Whigs* a majority at the opening of the Session. The Tories certainly increased their preponderance by the usual sharp practice in the Committee for Elections. Probably the difference between the Austrians and Burnet depends partly on the fact that they assign the purely Court vote to the Whig and to the Tory side respectively. But it should also be noticed that in many places there had been five candidates for a seat (see Ranke, *Eng. Gesch.*, VI. 500–1). This, of course, gave the really non-party man a chance. See also Klopp, IX. 201, 210, 212.

,, 35 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IX. 144–151.

386 12 See *Ibid.* IX. 202. Klopp's account of the Session, derived from the Austrian Archives, has much in common with that of Burnet.

387 4 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 261, 265, 280. Cf. with Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IX. 217–8.

,, 6 Wodrow, *Analecta*, I. 9 (June 17, 1701).

,, 12 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. xix, n. 2 and app. VI.

,, 17 Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Élec.*, II. 247.

,, 19 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IX. 423, shows that Somers made the same insinuation, which Klopp himself most plausibly refutes.

,, 28 *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 699.

,, 32 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 270–1.

,, 36 *Ibid.* p. 272 and n.

388 19 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 280–5; *Supp.* pp. 507–8. See the interesting remarks of Leibnitz in letters to Fabricius, 11 April, 1 Aug., 1701, ed. Dutens, vol. V. pp. 254, 257. See also Tenison's *Memoirs*, 3rd ed. pp. 84–91.

,, 36 Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19 g.—R. K. 5 (dated 10 March, [1700–1]); a copy will be found in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23.

,, 39 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 285.

389 26 Kemble, *State Papers*, p. 248. The interesting response of Leibnitz is in the Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS., Burnet bundle, 29–30 (Hanover, Sept. 10, 1701); part is printed in Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Électrice*, II. 285, without any intimation that the version is incomplete.

,, 39 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, IX. 210, 226–30, 236–7, 270–9, 323–4.

390 15 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 291–3.

,, 17 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, X. 3.

,, 25 Ranke, *Eng. Gesch.* VI. 554.

,, 38 Atterbury to Trelawny, Jan. 17, 1701–2, *Epistolary Corres.*, III. 64.

391 14 All this from Klopp, Macaulay, Burnet *in loco*. The reports do not always agree. Burnet (who ought to have known) says he and Tenison were with the King from Saturday morning onward; Klopp that Tenison was summoned on Saturday evening. Klopp mentions the bracelet, Macaulay the ring.

,, 16 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 304–6. It should be compared with the portrait of 1687, enshrined in the *Supp.* pp. 190–3. The doggrel Broadside elegy ascribed to the "Reverend Doctor Burnet" seems too poor even for Burnet's poetical bathos.

,, 27 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], I. 690 n.

,, 31 Cf. *ibid.* p. 690, with *Supp.* p. 191 and n.

,, last line. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 303, 306.

CHAPTER X.

PAGE LINE

392 9 Note to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 309.
393 2 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 309–10.
,, 4 *Ibid.* p. 317.
,, 7 Printed in the volume of Homilies and occasional sermons, published 1713, pp. 83–108.
,, 32 This probably explains Cunningham's strange language, *Hist.* I. 258.
,, 39 Sichel, *Life* of Bolingbroke, I. 141.
395 23 Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec l'Électrice*...II. 347 (May 12, 1702).
,, 30 *Ibid.* p. 354 (June 27, 1702).
396 19 Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS. I. xii., N. 4, Bl. 5.
,, Footnote no. 3. For a curious sequel to the affair, connected with the Prussian [Brandenburg] claim on Neuchatel, see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 482–3; and Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 184 (letter from Spanheim to Burnet, 28 Aug., 1707).
397 8 Lambeth MSS. 930 (31), 15 Aug. 1702.
,, 36 All this from Atterbury, *Epistolary Corres.*, IV. 453 note (*i.e.* a letter describing the incident from the preacher in question, Mr Bristowe).
399 17 Calamy's *Life*, I. 467–72. For Burnet's opinion as to the *Via Media* see also Wodrow's *Analecta*, II. 103; the detail as to the Prince is suggested by Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 28 (Burnet's account of the incident).
400 7 Stanhope's *Hist. of...the Reign of Anne*, 4th ed., London 1872, I. 91.
,, 40 Calamy's *Life*, I. 467, 472–4.
401 10 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 339–40; Luttrell's *Diary*, V. 257.
,, 29 Atterbury's *Epistolary Corres.*, IV. 431–5 and nn.
402 39 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 28.
403 21 Lathbury's *History of Convocation*, pp. 377–83; Burnet's *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 345–7.
,, 29 See a letter from Lawrence Hyde, Lord Rochester (the Chancellor's second son) in the *Life* of Burnet appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 703; also *Supp.* pp. 55–56.
404 13 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. x–xiv.
405 34 For all this see *ibid.* pp. xvi–xxi.
406 17 Coxe, *Life* of Marlborough, ed. 1847–8 [3 vols.], I. 131–6.
,, 20 *Ibid.* I. 144–5.
407 9 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 362–4; and the speech as printed, pp. 4, 6.
,, 36 *Cassandra*, no. II. p. 39.
408 7 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 369–71; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XI. 30–1.
,, 22 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 380.
,, 36 *Ibid.* pp. 381–5; Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XI. 41, 91–202.
409 1 Coxe, *Life* of Marlborough, *in loco.*
,, 9 Salisbury Cathedral Registers.
,, 35 Coxe's *Marlborough* (1847), I. 231–2, 233–4. See also for the effect of the battle, Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XI. 342.
410 5 Coxe, *Life* of Marlborough, I. 235.
411 1 *Lockhart Papers*, I. 42; *Lockhart Memoirs*, pp. 1–94 are useful for the state of parties.
,, 26 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], 360 [357–60; erroneous duplicate pagination], 371–8. Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XI. 11–14.
412 17 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 395–400; *Lockhart Papers*, I. 42, 94–8, 111–8; McPherson, *Original Papers*, I. 684–5 (July 8, 1704); Vernon III. 263.
413 17 For this paragraph see *Corres. George Baillie of Jerviswood* (p. 12), Nov. 12, 30, 1704; Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 402–3 n.; *Corres. George Baillie of Jerviswood*, pp. 14, 15 (Dec. 2) being a letter from Johnston.
,, 31 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 403–4.
414 2 *Ibid.* pp. 401–2. Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XI. 330.
,, 5 Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, pp. 394–5; Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 412–3.

PAGE LINE

414 16 *Hist, Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 412.
,, 19 See *infra, Bibliography.*
,, 27 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 425.
,, 32 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 89–94. The retort to the charge of laxity in the choice of associates compares rather quaintly with the expostulations of his early Memorial to the Scottish Bishops.
416 30 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 92[b].
,, 39 Coxe's *Life* of Marlborough, 1847, 3 vols., I. 346–8.
417 1 Burnet, *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 426.
,, 11 Luttrell's *Diary*, V. 536 (April 3, 1705).
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 512–13; the name of the candidate is supplied from *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XV., *App.* 4, p. 213. See also Bodl. MSS. Ballard XXI. 136 (May 23). "Mr Fox's success very much ruffled my "Lord of Sarum's Lawn Sleeves."
418 13 For the account of the county and Chippenham contests see *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XV., *App.* 4, pp. 244, 271; Luttrell's *Diary*, June 23, Nov. 22 (V. 565, 614); Bodl. MSS. *Hearne*, V. 361.
,, 15 Reference lost.
,, 25 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 513.
419 22 Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, f. 9, dated Aug. 9, 4 o'clock. The other names suggested are those of Whitby, Fleetwood, Trimnell, and Bradford.
,, 27 See Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 30–33. The candidate favoured by Burnet, the Queen, and the Duchess of Marlborough was Dr White Kennett.
,, last line. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 426, 428.
420 6 *Ibid.* pp. 429–30.
,, 14 Stanhope's [Mahon's]...*Reign of Anne*, London 1872, I. 228.
,, 18 For Wharton's speech see *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 431.
,, 32 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 449, 504.
421 31 Cobbett's *Parl. Hist.*, VI. 485–92 (Dec. 6).
,, 38 See the bitter *Epitaph on the Church of England* printed in *N. and Q.*, Ser. II., II. 144. "She fell ill Nov. 5, 1688, died Dec. 6, 1706." See also Burnet's "Spittal" Sermon, Easter Monday 1706.
422 4 *Private Diary of William...Earl Cowper, Lord Chancellor*...Eton 1833, p. 33.
,, 8 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 441.
,, 11 *Ibid.* pp. 441–3; Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, p. 398.
,, 34 Extracts were included in the holocaust ordered by the Lower House in 1710, of which Burnet seems to approve. *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 541, 545.
423 14 Lambeth MSS. 930 (12). An imperfect copy is in Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 4292, f. 63.
424 5 See Lecky, *Hist. Eng. in Eighteenth Cen.*, 3rd ed. I. 44; Mahon; Sichel (*Life* of Bolingbroke), etc., etc., *in loco.*
,, 12 See on this Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart, in loco.*
,, 34 *Corres. of George Baillie of Jerviswood*, p. 179 (Dec. 31 [1706]).
425 13 Luttrell's *Diary*, VI. 51, 155, March 22, and early in April 1707.
426 2 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 459–63.
,, 6 *Baillie of Jerviswood, Corres.*, pp. 169, 175 (p. 122 perhaps refers to Burnet of Kenmay.
,, 8 *Hist. Own Time*, II. 463–4.
,, 15 Luttrell's *Diary*, VI. 143 (Feb. 27, 1706–7).
,, 20 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 470; Lathbury, *Hist. Convoc.*, p. 402. The prorogation was from Feb. 12 to March 19.
,, 32 *Biographia Britannica* (ed. Kippis), III. 33; on the authority of a guest who was present.
427 17 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 510–11.
428 18 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 22908, f. 33 (March 21, 1699–1700).
,, 23 See her touching little letter to Mr Colbatch, Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 22908, f. 45.
,, 28 *Ibid.* ff. 43–4; Jan. 1701–2; see also *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 511–2.
,, 35 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 512.
429 25 *Private Correspondence of Sarah Duchess of Marlborough* (1838), I. 68–9 (April 29, 1707).

PAGE LINE

429 27 Bodl. MSS. Rawlinson 1092, ff. 111 et seqq. The passages quoted from it will be found on ff. 115b, 118b, 126, 128.

,, 33 Atterbury, *Epistolary Corres.* (reference lost).

430 1 "Fort contente de l'esprit et des manières de cette Dame" (Letter to Burnet of Kenmay, Dec. 29, 1707); *Opera*, ed. Dutens VI. 278.

,, 27 Cf. with this Klopp, *Corres. de L. avec l'Élec.*...III. 42; *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XII. 22 et. seq.

,, 29 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XV., *App.* 4, pp. 455–6; Bodl. MSS. Ballard XXI. 74.

,, 39 Lambeth MSS. 941 (17); an incorrect copy is in Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane, 4292, f. 46.

431 4 Luttrell's *Diary*, VI. 121, 139, 143, 172–3, 177.

,, 11 Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 175–7. For Nic. Crizzo see Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, VIII. 505, IX. 353.

432 21 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 494–6. Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XIII. 24 shows Burnet's is the original on which all subsequent accounts have been based.

433 4 Coxe, *Life* of Marlborough (ed. 1847–8), II. 194–5.

434 6 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 418–19.

,, 10 *Ibid.* XV. 449. "*June*" is there probably a slip for *July*.

,, 12 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 633–639; and *Supp.* pp. 449–50.

,, 15 The original (*ibid.*) differs little from that in the printed *History*.

,, 32 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 656.

,, 34 *Ibid.* p. 517.

435 9 *Ibid.* pp. 657–8 (the passage in brackets is from the original draught, *Supp.* p. 449).

,, 13 *Ibid.* pp. 658–9 (and *Supp.* p. 450).

,, 18 *Ibid.* p. 659 (and *Supp.* p. 450).

,, 26 *Ibid.* pp. 660, 661, 663, 665.

436 5 *Ibid.* pp. 634–48.

,, 12 *Ibid.* pp. 648–651.

,, 22 *Ibid.* pp. 652–3.

,, 26 *Ibid.* pp. 653, 650–1.

,, 28 *Ibid.* pp. 651–2.

,, last line. *Ibid.* pp. 652, 653.

437 5 *Ibid.* pp. 666–669.

439 2 *New Atalantis*, 6th edition, I. 140.

,, 9 Pref. to her *Method of Devotion*, 2nd ed.

,, 10 The Will is at Somerset House.

,, 22 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XV., *App.* IV. 521 (Feb. 18 [1709]).

,, 28 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509.

,, 30 *Ibid.*

,, 37 *Life* (by son) appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], p. 720.

440 21 For this account of "St John's" see Strype's *Stow*, ed. 1720, vol. II. Bk. IV. pp. 62 et sqq. with the fine accompanying plan; *Gentleman's Mag.* LXXXVII. (1) 497 (with picture of the house as in 1817); *N. and Q.*, Ser. II., VII. 509; *Hist. Clerkenwell* (Pinks' and Wood's), pp. 319, 687. To this useful work my attention was drawn by Mr Christmas, house-painter, of Clerkenwell, who is deeply interested in the antiquities of his locality, and courteously pointed out to me the site of Burnet House which he well remembers.

,, 35 *Life* (by son) appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], p. 721 and Onslow's n.

441 5 *Ibid.* p. 720.

,, 25 See the portrait of the Latitudinarian Bishop; the reference to the burning of the *Pastoral Letter*.

,, 32 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 538; *Supp.* p. 427.

442 1 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XV., *App.* IV. 532.

,, 10 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XII. 386.

,, 19 Bodl. MSS. Hearne, XXIII. 60.

,, 24 The printed *Trial* (1710), pp. 247–8.

443 34 Cobbett's *Parl. Hist.* VI. 879. There is an amusing set of verses in the *Hist. Clerkenwell* which mentions Burnet as colloguing with his episcopal brethren on the eve of the verdict at the tea-gardens of Hockley-in-the-Hole, Clerkenwell.

PAGE LINE

445 3 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 547–8.

,, 15 See a printed *Letter to Mr B—— A North Wiltshire Clergyman* (Aug. 9, 1710).

,, 20 Of this we have seen three items; *A Letter to...a Citizen of New Sarum*; *An Answer to a Letter from a Citizen of New Sarum...*; and *The Salisbury Quarrel ended; or, The Last Letter of the Citizen of New Sarum* (dated Nov. 25, 1710). See also an article by the present writer in *Memorials of Old Wiltshire*, which unfortunately contains some inaccuracies corrected in the present work.

,, 26 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 513.

446 5 Luttrell's *Diary*, VI. 688; Bodl. MSS. Hearne, XXVIII. 48; Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane 376, f. 147 (Bp of Sarum v. Nash, 7 Feb. 1710); *The Whigs' New Toast to the B——p of S——y*, 1711; Cockburn, *Specimen*, p. 39.

,, 32 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 554.

447 3 *Supp. Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 432.

,, 16 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 557—73; Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, pp. 406 et sqq.

448 16 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 582–3.

449 9 *Ibid.* pp. 583–86.

,, 16 *Ibid.* pp. 588–9, 592–3.

,, 25 The story is given in the *Hist. Clerkenwell*, p. 326, without reference. The story concerning Shakespeare will be found in Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, IV. 724.

450 3 *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 33 (from *Annual Register*, IV. 29).

,, 8 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 590; see also p. 593.

,, 18 *Ibid.* I. 596 n.

,, 31 *L. J.* XIX. 461[a], 478[b], 480[b]; 474, 479[b], 481[a] (see also Roger's *Protests of the Lords*, I. 209–17).

,, footnote. *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 33 (from the information of a "valued correspondent"). The anecdote in Wodrow, *Analecta*, III. 302–3, is evidently an inferior variant of the first story.

451 3 Lambeth MSS. 941 (17), 27 Aug. 1707.

,, 21 Burnet describes these acts in *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 594–6. A curious tract *A Narrative of the late Treatment of the Episcopal Ministers within the City of Edinburgh*...London...1708, was lent to the author by Mr Clarke. Some sensible references to the affair will be found in Nicholson's *Letters*.

,, 31 Wodrow, *Analecta*, II. 174 (March, 1713).

,, 35 The date and occasion of this saying are very obscure, but we give what seems to us the true explanation. Wodrow's original entry occurs in his *Analecta*, II. 282, March 10, 1714, on the authority of Mr J. Hamilton. Wodrow transferred the anecdote to his *Hist.* (see ed. 1829–30, IV. 271[b]), where it is placed *sub anno* 1683 and referred to a period when the Doctor was in Scotland. Now Burnet was never in Scotland after 1674; and before that date cannot possibly have expressed such a sentiment. But he was certainly *in correspondence* with the Duchess of Hamilton *about this time*; and we think our interpretation fits all the facts.

452 9 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XXXVI. 57 (13 April, 1712). See also Ballard, XXXVI. 78 (11 July, 1713).

,, 21 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 603.

,, 33 *Ibid.*; White Kennett's *Life*, pp. 124–7, 145; Leibnitz to Burnet, 18 Oct., 1712 (*Opera*, ed. Dutens, vol. VI. pt I. 286–8).

453 12 *Sermon* preached at Salisbury, Nov. 7, 1710. See also *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 603–4.

454 25 For all this see the letters as published. Burnet's first letter is dated (in the original edition of the first two letters only) St John's, Feb. 13, 1710–11. His second, 24 April, 1710–11. Whiston's remarks on Burnet (Memoirs pp. 191–2) afford an amusing comparison. He says Burnet had not studied the Fathers for 30 years. It should be noted, as regards the Nonjuring Episcopate, that Ken still survived, but had formally resigned in favour of Hooper. (Plumptre's *Life* of Ken, II. 131–2, 191–5.)

455 11 Translated from the *Latin* original, Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. h.—R. K. 6 (a copy of which is now among Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23).

PAGE LINE

It is dated March 17, O.S. 1712, after the Scotch fashion, *i.e.* it is March $\frac{17}{28}$, $17\frac{11}{12}$, according to the strictly "Old" and "New" styles. Van Limborch died during the following month.

455 24 *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 512–13.

456 14 For all this see Article on William Burnet *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 38–9; Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772 (f. 12), [Tho. Fletcher (*i.e.* Thomas Burnet) to G. Duckett], May 24, 1712; Bodl. MSS. Hearne, XXXVI. 31–33; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 471, and *Diary* of William Cowper...Lord Chancellor, p. 12 (for Dean Stanhope).

,, 34 *Analecta*, III. 363. The allusion is to the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*... 1656, a collection of Socinian works, so called because Poland was the first country, except Transylvania, where Unitarians as such were tolerated (information kindly contributed by the late Dr Garnett, shortly before his death). An article on Gilbert is in *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 39. The generosity of Gilbert to William is mentioned in the latter's will (Somerset House).

457 12 For Thomas Burnet see *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 39–40. For his youthful escapades and the legends as to the nature of the Mohock gang see Bodl. MSS. Hearne, XXXIV. 28 (April 1, 1712); Coxe, *Life* of Marlborough, III. 289–90; Swift's Journal to Stella, 8 March, 1711–12 (*Letters*, XLIII.); Hamilton (Charles), *Transactions during the Reign of Queen Anne*, pp. 253–5; T. Burnet to George Duckett, Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772, ff. 9–10.

,, 19 *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 40; T. Burnet to Duckett, Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772, f. 43 undated.

,, 25 Burnet's account of the affair is in *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 612.

,, 35 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XVI. 49.

458 34 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 616–20, 623–7.

459 6 *Ibid.* p. 619.

,, 8 Lady Lugard, *A Tropical Dependency*, p. 333.

,, 13 *L. J.* XIX. 756, July 8, 1714.

,, 20 *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 619–21, 622–3.

,, last line. *Ibid.* pp. 630–1.

461 32 Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. d. 1. 83 (2 Jan., 1712–3; 2 Feb., 1712–3) (copies only).

,, last line. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 7–9 (Advertisement of Christmas, 1713); *ibid.* VII. 8 (Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 5853, f. 104^{b}—no. 672); *ibid.* VII. 220–3 (Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 76–7); *ibid.* VII. 223–4 (the letter is erroneously attributed to a *Duke* of Hamilton).

462 13 *The Introduction*, 2nd ed. pp. 27–8.

,, 18 *Ibid.* pp. 29–36.

,, 22 *Ibid.* pp. 36–47.

,, 25 *Ibid.* pp. 60–7.

,, 30 *Ibid.* pp. 67–72.

463 10 Swift, *Works* (Scott's 2nd edition), I. 180.

,, 29 *Biog. Brit.* ed. Kippis, III. 33; from Swift's *Works*, 24 mo. ed. vol. XVII.

,, 31 We may mention [Sewell's] *Third Letter*, dated York, December the 10th entitled *An Introduction to the Life and Writings of G——t Lord Bishop of S——m*; and *Speculum Sarisburianum, by Philoclerus*, dated Dec. 26, 1713, St Stephen's Day, a Martyr out of Smithfield.

464 8 Swift's *Works* (2nd ed. Scott), I. 79, 91, III. 180.

,, 12 *Ibid.* p. 180.

,, 29 Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772, f. 46^{b}.

,, 35 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XV., *App.* VII. 212. For Burnet's views on duelling see *Sermon* preached before the Queen...11th of March $169\frac{3}{4}$, p. 27; *An Exposition of the Church Catechism* (1710), p. 164.

465 4 Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, I. 397, VIII. 369; *Life* of White Kennett, pp. 140–1. The Church was St Mary's, Whitechapel.

466 16 *The Reasons for writing against the Bishop of Salisbury. With Remarks upon his Lordship's Spittal Sermon*...by Mr Sewell...1714 (p. 7).

,, 26 *Some few obvious and just remarks on the Bishop of Sarum's...Spittle Sermon* (sic)...by a Tory...1714 (p. 11).

,, 31 Klopp, *Fall d. H. Stuart*, XIV. 555–6.

PAGE LINE

467 6 Cobbett, *Parl. Hist.* VI. 1344–5.

,, 27 Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XXXI. 97, 133. For the Arianism of Burnet's sons and their friendship with Clarke see also Whiston's *Historical Memoirs of... Dr Samuel Clarke*, third ed., London, 1748, p. 20. Clarke however had been a friend of the family, ere suspected of heterodoxy. See *Life* of Catherine Cockburn, I. XXXI.

468 6 *A Sermon...and...Charge...at the Triennial Visitation*...1714...pp. 38–9.

,, 9 *Ibid.* p. 50.

,, 21 *Ibid.* pp. 51–3.

,, 30 *Ibid.* p. 63.

,, 31 *Ibid.* p. 64.

,, 35 *Ibid.* p. 11.

,, 39 *Ibid.* pp. 27–31.

469 4 Burnet's Episcopal Register at Salisbury; *L. J.* XIX., 25 June, 1714, et sqq.

470 10 Lecky, *Hist. Eng. Eighteenth Cen.*, 2nd ed. I. 207; from W. Wilson, *Hist....Dissenting Churches...in London*, III. 513.

,, 13 Burnet's Episcopal Register at Salisbury.

471 5 *Analecta*, III. 296 (recorded April, 1726).

,, 26 *Ibid.* II. 298 (Nov. 1714).

,, 40 *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XI., *App.* 5, f. 322.

472 3 T. Burnet to Duckett, Oct. 14, 1714; Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772, f. 79^{b}.

,, 26 Zachary Grey's *Review of Mr Daniel Neal's History of the Puritans...in a letter to Mr David Jennings*, Cambridge, 1744, pp. 62–3 n. A MS. copy of the letter will be found in Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 5831, f. 155, date Jan. 29, 1714–15. Grey says he printed it from the original.

,, 30 Hickes left his papers to Bedford (*Dict. Nat. Biog.* Art. Hickes); and Hilkiah Bedford is believed to be the author of the *Pref.* to *The Celebrated Story of the Thebean Legion no Fable, in answer to the objections of Doctor Gilbert Burnet...written in the year* 1687 *by a Dignify'd Clergyman of the Church of England* [*i.e.* Hickes], *and now first published from the author's own MS.*...London: Printed 1714. (See Birch's *Life* of Tillotson, 2nd ed. p. 317.)

,, 32 See *Dict. Nat. Biog.* art. Bedford; *State Trials*, XV. 1328–9 and n.

473 5 Bodl. MSS. Add. Eng. Hist. d. 1. p. 84.

,, 8 See his letters in *Gentleman's Mag.*, LXI. 725, 788, LIII. 102.

,, 21 Printed with *Life* appended *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 725.

,, 38 *Ibid.* pp. 724–5 (we have a little altered the order of the phrases).

474 2 T. Burnet to Duckett, March 29, 1715 (Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36772, f. 88).

,, 9 *Ibid.* f. 88.

,, 15 His Will, first edition, p. 13. Had he died at Salisbury, he desired to be buried "in the South Aisle of the Cathedral, where two of my children lie buried." There is no record to be found of the actual spot.

,, 16 *Gentleman's Mag.* 1788, pt 2 (vol. LVIII.) 952; from a newspaper of March 26, 1716 (1715?).

,, 22 Pinks' and Wood's, *Hist. Clerkenwell*, pp. 59–60, 687; both stones are there engraved.

,, 26 Several of these satires (seizing on the accident that the death of the notorious Lord Wharton almost coincided with that of Burnet) imagine, with caustic relish, their meeting in the Infernal Shades. See for example Bodl. MSS. Ballard, XLVII. 72. Other posthumous pasquinades are in Bodl. MSS. Ballard, L. f. 175; *ibid.* XLI. 194; *Histrio Theologicus* (1715); the Elliott *Specimens* with their scandalous comments, 1715; *N. and Q.*, Ser. I., v. 58 (*State Poems*, III. 207, 1704 prints this as an epitaph on Coleman); and, by far the least bitter and wittiest, *Notes and Memorandums* (sic) *of the Six Days preceding the death of a late Right Reverend*—usually ascribed to Arbuthnot—which ran through at least two editions in 1715. In this the weaknesses of the old prelate, whose supposed utterances are given in the first person, are hit off to the life; and he rambles on about his own Works, his Secret History, the dangers of Popery, the iniquities of son Thomas, the details of his illness, the state of his soul, historical anecdote and his own great acquaintances in a very entertaining rigmarole. The epitaph with which it concludes is worth quoting:

PAGE LINE

Subtus
Cineres jam tandem, quod non ipse optavit
In Pace requiescunt.
Vir erat ingenio satis callido, & versatili,
Nativo solo familiari;
In rebus sacris Magnus, Fabulosis Major,
In Politicis (si ipsi credas) Maximus!
Veritatis cultor adeò fidelis
Ut æque in Vitâ, ac Scriptis elucescat.
In concionando acer erat, vehemens, indefessus,
Puriorem Doctrinam habuere multi,
Pulmones, & latera robustiora nemo.
Adeo Romæ per omnia aversus
Ut ad Genevam deflecteret.
Obiit, in Universum Dissentientium
Ab Ecc. Angl. luctum,
Martiis Calendis.

We should also perhaps mention here, though it is later in date, the so-called *Moss* or *Wagstaffe* epigram on Burnet's *Hist. Own Time*, for which see *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, I. ix; Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, I. 661, IV. 239; Brit. Mus. MSS. Stowe, 728, f. 14; Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 5831, f. 131^{b}. Another epigram on the *Hist. Own Time* is in *N. and Q.*, Ser. I., II. 372.

Many earlier squibs upon Burnet have been mentioned in the text; but we may here call attention to those in *State Poems*, III. 392; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XII., *App.* IX. 191–2; *The Mitred Club, or the Lambeth Consultation*, 1704, seen by Professor Firth, who kindly drew attention to it; Bodl. MSS. Rawl. D. 383 (136), etc., etc. The best of all, though one of the most unscrupulous, is the pseudo-epitaph given in *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* VI. 468: attributed to Swift. (For other copies see Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 6416, f. 19^{b}; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* XII., *App.* IX. 191–2; Bodl. MSS. Ballard, L., f. 176.)

474 28 Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 36772, f. 88.

,, 38 The *Auction Catalogue* of his library is among similar Catalogues in the British Museum (351. 6. 7 (9), March 17, 17$\frac{5}{6}$).

,, last line. For an account of Burnet's descendants as far as traced see *Family of Burnett of Leys*, pp. 140–1.

475 footnote no. 1. For other portraits of Burnet see *Family of Burnett of Leys*, p. 142, where one is engraved.

,, 30 Wodrow, *Analecta*, III. 146 [March, 1724]; *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. Portland MSS.* VII. 367–8.

,, last line. See the *Pref.* to *Supp. Hist. Own Time.* It should however be mentioned that any evidence which has come to light since that Preface was written, increases the probability of posthumous "castration." It is clear that documents inserted in the *Life* were freely "edited" even when a note specifically *suggested* that they were printed from the originals (see *supra*, pp. 159, 344 n.). See also the correspondence between Walpole and Townshend on the subject of the Dedication of the *Hist.* (Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36270, ff. 9–10) and the remarks in Wodrow's *Analecta*, IV. 194, which suggest motives for revision. It is perhaps significant that the "Hardwicke" copy of the "castrations" accompanies the Walpole-Townshend correspondence (Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36270, ff. 11–47).

476 5 Macaulay, *Hist. Eng.* ed. 1858, etc. (8 vols.), II. 432–6; Von Ranke *Eng. Gesch.* ed. 1868, etc. vol. VII. *App.* II. pp. 156–176; Lecky, *Hist. Eng. Eighteenth Cen.* 2nd ed. vol. I. pp. 80–83.

APPENDIX II.

Chronological table of Burnet's published works; founded on the admirable list by Roger Flexman (appended to his ed. of *Hist. Own Time* [1753], and reprinted in Clarendon Press editions of 1823 and 1833), on the Catalogues of the Brit. Mus., Bodleian, Cambridge University, Advocates', and Trinity College (Dublin) Libraries, on Professor Arber's *Term Catalogues*, etc., etc.[1]

1665. *A Discourse on the Memory of that rare and truly virtuous Person Sir Robert Fletcher of Saltoun.... Written by a Gentleman of his Acquaintance....*Edinburgh, Printed by a Society of Stationers...1665.

Anon. but ascribed to Burnet by his contemporary and acquaintance, J. Cockburn, D.D.

[1666.] *A Memorial of diverse grievances...in this Church.*

First pub. *Misc. Scot. Hist. Soc.* II. 1904, 340–358, ed. H.C.F.

[1668?] *Thoughts on Education. By the late Bishop Burnet. Now first published from an original Manuscript.* London 1761 [8vo.].

Not mentioned by Burnet or pub. in his lifetime.

1669. *A modest and free Conference betwixt a Conformist and a Non-conformist, about the present distempers of Scotland. In six Dialogues.* By a Lover of Peace [Motto, Gal. v. 15]. Published by Order...1669.

Anon.; acknowledged by Burnet in his *Autobio.* Flexman says it was printed at Glasgow, Aldis says at Edinburgh.

1669. The second edition now in seven dialogues [Edin.?].

[1671?] Copy of verses [to the Duchess of Lauderdale].

Ascribed to him by Maidment, who pub. it in *Cat. Scot. Writers*, pp. 56–9 n.

1671. Letter to the unknown author of *Jus populi* [price 3*d.*].

Not seen; not mentioned by Burnet; not included in Flexman's list. Mentioned by Lauder, *Journal*, p. 285; included in *Catalogue* of Advocates' Library, IV. 291.

[1] The original edition (except where the contrary is specifically stated) has been in all cases seen by the present writer. It is not however claimed that the list of editions is exhaustive, or that copies of all editions mentioned have been seen. The preliminary dates are those of publication, save when enclosed in brackets; the date in such cases is that of composition.

[1671?] *A Resolution of two important Cases of Conscience.*

Sometimes called "The Case of Barrenness." Not pub. by author, but in the following works with attestation of authenticity from Paterson, Bishop of Glasgow.

1725. Bevell Higgons (*Remarks on Burnet*, pp. 234–43) gives 2nd case only, treating first as too indecent for publication.
1727. *Ibid.* 2nd ed. 159–65.
1733. *Memoirs of John Macky, Esq., App.* pp. xxv–xxxiii. [Both cases given.]
1736. Bevell Higgons, *Remarks* reissued in his *Historical Works*, II. 159–65.
1739. In Chamber's *Bibliotheca Recondita*, II. 3–5. This seems to be repr. from Macky with his pref. and some comments.

1673. *A Vindication of...the Church and State of Scotland. In four Conferences. Wherein the answer to the Dialogues betwixt the Conformist and the Nonconformist is examined.* By Gilbert Burnet, Professor of Theology in Glasgow. Glasgow...Robert Sanders, Printer to the City and University, 1673.

[Appendix on Pseudo-Apostolic Canons has a separate title-page.]

Represented among Books "printed and published" London, Easter Term 1674 [*Term Cat.*]. This means that the "remainder" brought to England by Burnet was "sold by" Moses Pitt, the London publisher.

1675. *Dedication only* (?) repr. for Lauderdale in London. Not seen.
[1689?] Jacobite pseudo-ed. mentioned by Hickes. Probably this is the edition, *dated* 1673, which has not the Glasgow *Arms* on title-page.
1724. *A Vindication of the Authority, Constitutions and Laws of the Church and State of Scotland. In four Conferences. To which are annexed Observations* [on two of the Apostolic Canons]. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. Late Lord Bishop of Sarum. The second edition, London. W. Mears...and D. Browne... 1724.

1673. *Rome's Glory; or a Collection of divers Miracles wrought by Popish Saints...with a prefatory Discourse.* Printed for M. Pitt...London, 1673.

Pub. Trin. Term. Anon. Not acknowledged by Burnet, but in Flexman's list.

1673. *The Mystery of Iniquity unveiled; in a discourse...of the Roman Church....* By Gilbert Burnet, Chaplain in ordinary to his Majesty. Printed by W. Godbid, and are to be sold by M. Pitt. 1673.

May have been previously published in Scotland, but such ed. not seen, or mentioned by Aldis.

1673. Repr. by Moses Pitt, Mich. Term.
1688. As *A discourse...of the*, etc. London...J. Watts...1688.
1688. The same, 2nd ed. (same year).
1689. Eas. Term.
1738. In Gibson's *Preservative against Popery* [I. 105].
1848. Another ed. same work. 8vo.
1837. In Cardwell's *Enchiridion.*

1674. *An Account given by J. Ken a Jesuit, of the truth of Religion, examined.* 8vo.

See Flexman's list and Burnet's *Autobio.*; not seen.

1674–5. *Subjection for Conscience-sake asserted: in a Sermon Preached at Covent-Garden-Church Dec. the sixth*, 1674. By Gilbert Burnet. London...Royston...1675. [Rom. xiii. 5.]

First pub. separately, Hil. Term 1674–5.

1675. *The Royal Martyr lamented, in a Sermon preached at the Savoy on King Charles the Martyr's day*, $167\frac{4}{5}$. By Gilbert Burnet. London. Printed [with the former] for R. Royston...1675. [2 Sam. ii. 12.]

Appeared bound up with remainder of former, Easter Term 1675; see below.

1689. Separate reprint.

Issues of the two Sermons as; The Royal Martyr and the Dutiful Subject.

1675. Easter Term.

1689. Jacobite repr. on Revolution. London. Printed for Luke Meredith... 1689.

1698–9. Hil. Term. Jac. repr. by L. Meredith [*Term Cat.*].

1710. Jacobite repr. for Sacheverell's trial. London, repr. by J. Redmayne for L. Meredith...1710.

1675. *A Rational Method for proving the Truth of the Christian Religion, as it is professed in the Church of England. In answer to...J. K.* By Gilbert Burnet. London. Printed for Richard Royston, Bookseller to His most Excellent Majesty. 1675.

Licensed Feb. 27, 1674–5. Pub. Eas. Term.

1692. (Mich. Term) 2nd ed.

1676. *A relation of a Conference held about Religion...by E. Stillingfleet ...and Gilbert Burnet with some Gentlemen of the Church of Rome.* London. Printed for Moses Pitt...1676. [8vo.]

Trin. Term.

1679. 2nd ed. as *A Conference at London the Third of April* 1676 *between Dr Edw. Stillingfleet Dean of St Paul's and G. Burnet with Edw. Coleman, now executed for conspiring the death of the King and Subversion of the Protestant Religion, and some others*....London...Moses Pitt...1679.

1687. London.

1676. *A modest Survey of...a Discourse...entitled Naked Truth...* London. Printed for Moses Pitt...1676.

Dated May 23, imprimatur May 26, 1676. Pub. Trin. Term. Anon. Not acknowledged by Burnet, but assigned to him by Moses Pitt in printed *Letter* of 1695.

1676. Mich. Term. 2nd ed.

1676–7. [*The Life of God in the Soul of Man, Or, The Nature and Excellency of the Christian Religion...and*] *An Account of the beginnings and advances of a Spiritual Life* [*in two Letters*] *written to Person*[*s*] *of Honour...* [Mottoes: Eph. iv. part of verse 18, Gal. ii. 20, Rom. viii. 14.] Printed for Charles Smith...and William Jacob...London, 1677.

Imprimatur Aug. 18, 1676. Pub. Mich. Term, 1676 [*Term Cat.*]. Pref. signed G. Burnet, and its terms, though guarded, shew the sec. tract to be his.

[*Ed. only given which are known to exist and which include any of Burnet's work.*]

1691. Trin. Term [*Term Cat.*]. London, with pref. and 2nd tract.

1700. 3rd ed., corrected, with Table. Trin. Term [*Term Cat.*]. London, with pref. and 2nd tract.

1707. *With a Preface by Gilbert Burnet, now Lord Bishop of Sarum.... The fifth edition carefully corrected. To which is added a Table.* London... Thomas Bever...1707. (2nd tract included.)

1722. French ed. Delf, as *La Nature de la Religion Chrétienne*, one of several tracts from the English. Burnet's pref. but not his tract.

1739. 7th ed. London, with pref. and 2nd tract.

1742. Newcastle, with pref. and 2nd tract. 12mo.

1782. London, 12th ed. with pref. and 2nd tract.

1791. With pref. but not 2nd tract.

[1800?] London. Pref. but not 2nd tract.

1807. 15th ed. London, with pref. and 2nd tract. 12mo.

1818. London [Scougal's *Works*], with pref. but not 2nd tract.

1819. 18th ed. London, pref. and 2nd tract.

1822. [Scougal's *Works*], pref. but not 2nd tract.

1677. *A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England....* By Gilbert Burnet. London. Printed...for R. Chiswell...1677.

Eas. Term.

[1685.] See Collection *a*. Some copies of this at least contain the following ed.

1688. 2nd ed. London.

[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1848. In Gibson's *Preservative against Popery*.

1677–8. *The Memoires of the Lives and Actions of James and William Dukes of Hamilton....In which an account is given of the rise and progress of the Civil Wars of Scotland and other great Transactions....Together with letters...written by King Charles I. never before published. All drawn out, or copied from the Originals.* By Gilbert Burnet in seven books. London. Printed for...R. Royston, Bookseller to the King...1677.

[Behind the frontispiece "The History of the Church and State of "Scotland, the 2nd part. In seven Books."]

Pub. Eas. Term, 1677–8. The 1st vol. (missing from most copies) is Spottiswoode's *Hist. Church of Scotland*, ed. IV. Sometimes catalogued under Spottiswoode's name.

1852. [Oxford Clarendon Press] as *Lives of the Hamiltons*.

1677–8. [*The New Politick Lights of Modern Rome's Church Government, or the new Gospel according to Cardinal Pallavicini, revealed by him in his History of the Council of Trent. Englished out of French.* London... T. Flesher...and H. Bonwicke...1678.]

Original author identified in Arber, *Term Cat.* with J. Le Noir. Trans. and pref. anon. [but see ed. 1681 below]. In *Term Cat.* Mich. 1677.

1678. [New ed.? or Remainder? issued under title *Rome à la Mode, or The true Sentiments of the Court and Cardinals there, as they are delivered by Cardinal Pallavicini in his History of the Council of Trent. Written originally in French, by one of that Communion; and now translated into English.* London...T. Flesher...R. Sollen...H. Bonwicke. (*Term Cat.* Trin. 1678.) [Not seen.]

1681. [New ed.? or Remainder? as *The Policy of Rome...delivered by Cardinal Pallavicini in his History of the Council of Trent. Englished out of French.* With a preface by Gil[bert] Burnet, D.D. London...Flesher... 1681. [Probably book not a success and Burnet's name revealed on title-page, when he had become popular, to sell it.]

1678. *A Sermon preached at St Dunstan's in the West at the Funeral of Mrs Anne Seile the 18th of July*, 1678. By Gilbert Burnet. Printed by Mary Clark [on Ephes. v. 15]. London, 1678.

Not in *Term Cat.* (Mrs Seile was a Fleet Street Bookseller.) It is the sermon mentioned by Letsome; see Flexman's *Postscript*, *Hist. Own Time*, ed. 1833, VI. 366.

1678. *A Letter written upon the Discovery of the late Plot*...London. Printed for H. Brome and R. Chiswell...1678.

Licensed Oct. 17. Pub. Mich. Term. Anon.

[**1685.**] See Collection *a* [no. 2].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1678. *The unreasonableness and impiety of Popery: in a second Letter written upon the Discovery of the late Plot.* London...Chiswell...1678.

Licensed Nov. 12, 1678. Pub. Mich. Term. Anon.

[**1685.**] See Collection *a* [no. 3].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1678. *A Relation of the Barbarous and Bloody Massacre of about an hundred thousand Protestants...in the Year* 1572....London...Richard Chiswell...1678.

Pub. Mich. Term. Anon. but ascribed to Burnet in publisher's advertisements.

[**1685.**] See Collection *a* [no. 4].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1679. *A Decree made at Rome the second of March*, 1679. *Condemning some Opinions of the Jesuits and other Casuists.* London...Richard Chiswell...1679.

Eas. Term. 1679. Anon. but ascribed to Burnet in publisher's advertisements.

[**1685.**] See Collection *a* [no. 5].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1679. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. The first Part of the Progress made in it during the Reign of Henry VIII.* By Gilbert Burnet. London...Chiswell...1679 [fol.].

(Trin. Term.)

1681. London. 2nd ed.
(For ed. with vol. II. see that vol.; and for ed. of whole work see vol. III.)

1680. *The Infallibility of the Roman Church examined and confuted. In a Letter to a Roman Priest.* By Gilbert Burnet. London. Printed for H. Brome and B. Tooke. 1680.

Term Cat. says *Reprinted* Trin. Term, 1680, but this probably an error of arrangement.

1680. *Some Passages of the Life and Death of the right honorable John* [*Wilmot*] *Earl of Rochester who died* 26 *July*, 1680....By Gilbert Burnet. London...Chiswell...1680.

Written before Burnet became D.D. Pub. Mich. Term.

1681. Dublin.
1692. London.
1698. German edition, Halle, as *Bericht vom Leben...des...Weltbekanten Atheisten...Grafen von Rochester.*
1700–1. (Trin. Term) 5th ed. London.
1716. French translation, Amsterdam.
1724. 6th ed. London. 8vo.
1752. Foulis, Glasgow.
1774. [With lives of Hale, etc. London.]
1775. German trans., Halle.
1782. [With Johnson's *Rochester*] London. 8vo.
1787. London. 12mo.
1800. London. 12mo.
1803, 1815, 1824. In Burnet's *Lives*, ed. Alexander Knox, Dublin. This said by Jebb to have been "frequently" reprinted by Dublin Society for discountenancing Vice.
1833. In the above work, ed. Jebb. London.
1833. The same, 2nd ed.
1805. London. 12mo.
1810. London. 12mo.
1810, 1818, 1839, 1853. In Wordsworth's *Eccles. Biography*, VI. 395 (1st 2 ed.), IV. 585, IV. 599.
1819. London. 12mo.
[1820?] Chedgrave. 12mo.
1820. London [Hackney]. 12mo.
1829. London, with Life of Hale.
[1830?] [With Lives of Hale and Bedell and Fell's *Hammond.*] London. 12mo.
1875. Fac. 1st ed. by Lord Ronald Gower, London.
1876. London.

[Abbreviated versions.]

[1690?] [As *The Libertine Overthrown*, or *A Mirror for Atheists.*]
1693. [As *A Mirror for Atheists.*]

1680. *A Sermon preached before the...Lord Mayor and Aldermen...at Bow Church Sept.* 2, 1680. *Being the Anniversary Fast for the burning of London.* By Gilbert Burnet. London...Chiswell...1680. [On Amos iv. 11, 12.]

Printed by desire. Mich. Term, 1680.

1681. 2nd ed.
1681. Another 2nd ed.
[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 8].
[1704.] See Collection *i.*

1680. *The conversion and persecution of Eve Cohan...who was baptized the 10th of October* 1680....London...Chiswell...1680.

Mich. Term. Anon. Ascribed to Burnet in publisher's advertisements.

[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 6].
[1704.] See Collection *i.*

1680. *The last words of Dr Lewis du Moulin; being his retractation of all the personal reflections he had made on the divines of the Church of England...signed by himself the 5th and 7th of October,* 1680. London. Printed for R. Royston, Bookseller to his Majesty.

Mich. Term. Anon. Burnet's attestation is appended.

1680. *A Sermon preached on the Fast-Day, December 22, 1680. At St Margarets Westminster before the Honourable House of Commons.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London...Chiswell...1681. [On Rev. iii. 2–3.]

Printed by desire. Hil. Term, 1681.

[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 7].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1680–1. *A Sermon preached before the Aldermen of the City of London at St Lawrence Church, Jan. 30, 1680–1. Being the Day of the Martyrdome of K. Charles I.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London... Chiswell...1681. [Zech. viii. 19.]

Printed by desire. Hil. Term, 1681.

1681. 2nd ed.
[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 9].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1681. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. The Second Part. Of the Progress made in it till the Settlement of it in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's Reign.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London... Chiswell. 1681 [fol.].

Hil. Term.

1683. 2nd ed. of this part, with remainder of part I (2nd ed.).
Editions of first two parts.
1683–5. French trans. by M. de Rosemond, Chiswell, London. 2 vols. 4to.
1687. French trans., Geneva. 2 vols. 12mo.
1687. French trans. by M. de Rosemond, Amsterdam. 2 vols. 12mo.
1689. Latin trans., Geneva. 1 vol. fol. (Query, by Melchior Mittelhorzer? see Kippis, *Biog. Brit.* III. 25 n.)
1694. French trans. by M. de Rosemond, Geneva. 4 vols. 12mo.
1715. 4th ed. Walthoe and...Tooke, London. 2 vols. fol. (with 1st ed. vol. III.).
(For subsequent editions of complete work, see vol. III.)

1681. *An Exhortation to Peace and Union. A Sermon preached at St Lawrence-Jury at the Election of the Lord Mayor of London on the 29th of September*, 1681. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London...Chiswell...1681. [Mat. xii. 25.]

Printed by desire. Mich. Term, 1681.

[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 10].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1681–2. *The Life and Death of Sir Matthew Hale, Knt. Sometime Lord Chief Justice of his Majesties Court of King's Bench.* Written by Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London. Printed for William Shrewsbury, at the Bible in Duke Lane...1682. [8vo.]

In *Term Cat.* Mich. Term, 1681, but bears date 1682.

1682. London. 4to.
1682. London. 12mo.
1682. 2nd ed. London (with notes by Baxter). 12mo.
1688. French trans. (by L. Du Mesnil). Amsterdam. 16mo.
? London. n.d. Quarto.
1689–96. With Hale's *Contemplations*. (Trin. Coll. Dub. Cat.)
1700. London.
1766. With Baxter's and Bates' *Collections* [abridged], II. 85.

1768. With Baxter's and Bates' *Christian Biography* [abridged], II. 85.
1774. With *Lives* of Rochester and Mary II by Burnet; also Baxter's notes on Hale and the Sermon of Parsons' on Rochester, 3 pt. London. Separate title-pages and register.
1803, 1815, 1824, 1833, 1833. In Burnet's *Lives* (see *supra Life* of Rochester), Dublin, London.
1805. [With Hale's works.] London. 2 vols. 8vo.
1806. Oxford (Clarendon Press). 8vo.
[1810?] Wootton-under-Edge.
1810, 1818, 1839, 1853. In Wordsworth's *Eccles. Biography*, VI. I (1st 2 eds.), IV. 507, IV. 521.
1829. With *Life* of Rochester, sm. 8vo.
[1830.] In Dove's English Classics with Burnet's *Life* of Bedell, and his *Life* of Rochester, and Fell's *Hammond*, London. 12mo.
1856. Oxford (Parker).

1681–2. *The History of the Rights of Princes in the disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Church-lands relating chiefly to the...Regale....To which is added...an Appendix.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London... Richard Chiswell...1682.

A PS. to Pref. mentions decree of Dec. $\frac{1}{11}$ [1681] as just received from France. Pub. Hil. Term, 1681–2. The *Collection* or Appendix has separate title-page and register, and is dated 1681.

1682. *The last Confession...of...Stern...delivered by him on the cart immediately before his execution, to Dr Burnet...with the last Confession of... Borowsky...with...an account...of their deportment....* Written by Gilbert Burnet, D.D. and Anthony Horneck, D.D. London...Chiswell...1682.

(They were condemned for the murder of Thomas Thynne.) Burnet's portion is dated March 11 [1681–2].

1746. In *Harl. Misc.* VIII. 184.
1811. The same, 2nd ed. VIII. 191.

1682. *The Abridgement of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London. Printed for R. C. and sold by T. Lawrence. 8vo.[1]

Eas. Term, 1682.

1683. Eas. Term, 2nd ed. London, Printed by J. D. for Richard Chiswell.
1719. 5th ed. London. [See *Abridgement* of vol. III.]
1728. 6th ed. 12mo. London. [See last entry.]

1682. *A Sermon preached at the funeral of Mr James Houblon... June* 28, 1682. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London...Chiswell...1682. [Ps. xxxvii. 37.]

Mich. Term.

[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 11].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1863. Another edition. London.

1682. *News from France: In a letter giving a Relation of the present State of the difference between the French King and the Court of Rome....* London...Chiswell. 1682.

Dated Paris, June 6, N.S. (Trin. Term). Anon., probably a revision by Burnet of letter from Fall.

[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 12].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[1] This edition is found with varying title-pages. Some copies have Chiswell's imprint.

1682–3. *A letter writ by the last Assembly-General of the Clergy of France to the Protestants inviting them to return to their Communion....* Translated...and examined by Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London...Chiswell... 1683.

Mich. Term, 1682.

1683. *Remarques sur les actes...traduit de l'Anglois, par M. de Rosemond.* London. 12mo.

1682. *An Answer to the Animadversions on the History of the Rights of Princes, &c.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London....Chiswell....1682.

Mich. Term, 1682.

[**1685.**] See Collection *a* [no. 13].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

[1683.] *Two Sermons preached in Newgate, before the Lord Russell, the Day before he Suffer'd.* [Rev. xiv. 13, Ps. xxiv. 4.]

First pub. in *Some Sermons...and an Essay towards a new Book of Homilies....* by...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum...1713 [pp. 141–169].

1742. In *Select Sermons...by Gilbert Burnett, D.D., Sometime Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, afterwards Bishop of Sarum....*Glasgow ...Robert Foulis...1742 [pp. 129–153]. (This is practically a new edition of the Homilies, with three of the occasional sermons, and that on Boyle's funeral.)

[1683.] [Burnet's Journal of Lord Russell's last week.]

Written on the 21st and 22nd July, 1683; first pub. in *General Dictionary*, 1739, VIII. 817–20.

1819. In Lord [John] Russell's *Life of Will. Lord Russell*, pp. 319 et sqq.
? The same, second edition [not seen].
1820. The same, third edition, II. 262–279.
1853. The same, fourth edition [in one vol.], p. 453.

[1683.] *An Account of...Lord Russell's...last speech and paper.*

Written probably 22nd or 23rd July, 1683; printed in *General Dictionary*, VIII. 821–2 n.

[1683.] *A Sermon concerning Popery...* [Ephes. i. 3.]

Preached [at St Clement's] in 1683, but first pub. in *Some Sermons...and an Essay towards a new Book of Homilies*....by...Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum...1713. XXIII. 107–139.

1746. Reprinted "with the Preface to the volume in which it is contained, "giving an account of the glorious Revolution." Edinburgh, R. Fleming and Co.

[1683.] [*Utopia. Written in Latin by Sir Thomas More, Chancellor of England.*] *Translated into English.* London, printed for R. Chiswell ...sold by G. Powell...1684. [Pref. not signed. Anon.]

Claimed by Burnet in *Autobio.* Written about 1683, but not pub. till Mich. Term, 1685, when he had left England.

1737. [With life of More.] Dublin.
1743. Glasgow.
1751. Oxford and London. "Improved by S. Williamson."
1753. Oxford and London. Revised by "a gentleman of Oxford."
1758. London, ed. Warner.

1762. Glasgow.
1795. In *Political Classics*. London. Vol. III. Burnet's Pref. replaced by a Life of More. It follows Rousseau's *Social Contract*.
1808. London.
1821. Glasgow.
1838. In vol. IV. of *Masterpieces of English Prose Literature*. (St John.)
1849. London.
1850. In *Phœnix Library*, ed. Morgan.
1885. In vol. XXIII. of Morley's *Universal Library*.
1889. Vol. CLXXXII. of Cassell's *National Library*.
[1904.] Vol. XLIII. of same. (New series.)
1906. In Methuen's *Standard Library*.

[1684.] *The Life of William Bedell, D.D., Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland.* London. Printed for John Southby...[*i.e.* Chiswell?]. 1685.

Anonymous. Written in 1684, pub. Hil. Term, 1684–5 (*Term Cat.*). Contains inserted marginal reference to death of Card. Grimaldi, Nov. 1685.

1687. French translation. 8vo. Amsterdam...1687. "Traduite de "l'Anglois de M. le Docteur Burnet par L. D. M." [Dumesnil.] Dedicated to the Archbishop of Paris in complimentary terms. Burnet (says the translator) has proposed the example of France to England; the translator will return the compliment.
1692. [Mich. Term.] *The Life of William Bedell....* Written by Gilbert Burnet, D.D., now Lord Bishop of Sarum....London...Chiswell. 1692.
1736. Dublin.
1758. Dublin.
[1830?] [With *Lives* of Hale and Rochester, and Fell's *Hammond*.] Dove. London.
[1835?] In *Christian Biography* (abridged). Rel. Tr. Soc. [London?]

1684. *A Sermon preached at the Chapel of the Rolls on the Fifth of November*, 1684.... By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London. Printed for the author and are to be sold by B. Baldwin....1684. (Ps. xxii. 21.)

Not in *Term Cat.*
[1685.] See Collection *a* [no. 14].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1684–5. *A Letter from Gilbert Burnet, D.D., to Mr Simon Lowth...[on] his late book of the subject of Church power....* London... Baldwin... 1685.

Dated London, Dec. 20, 1684. (Not in *Term Cat.*)
1685. Another ed. London.

1684–5. *An answer to a Letter to Dr Burnet occasioned by his Letter to Mr Lowth....* London... Baldwin...1685.

Undated. (Not in *Term Cat.*)
1685. Another ed. London.

1684–5. *A letter occasioned by the second letter to Dr Burnet written to a friend....* London...Baldwin...1685.

Dated Jan. 24. (Not in *Term Cat.*) [Signed.]

[1685.] See Collection *a* [nos. 15–17].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1685. *A Letter written to Dr Burnet, giving an account of Cardinal Pool's secret powers....*London...Baldwin...1685.

Signed W.C. and sometimes attributed to Sir William Coventry, but acknowledged by Burnet in a letter to Le Clerc (Remonstrant's Library, Amsterdam. J. 13 b.—R. K. no. 2).

[1685.] See Collection *a* [no 18].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1686. *A letter containing some remarks on the two papers writ by his late Majesty King Charles II, concerning religion.*

Anon. Must have been written and circulated in MS. soon after the publication of Charles II's papers (late in 1686), but was not immediately published. [See Postscript to Tract.] Only early printed copy seen is a single 4to sheet double col., no title-page or imprint. This may be the first edition, which was no doubt printed in Holland.

1687. French trans. *Lettre d'un gentilhomme Anglois à son ami touchant* [etc., etc.]...Amsterdam...1687.
1687. In *Six Papers*.
1689. German trans. from the French, appended trans. King Charles's letters, by "S.F.S. a R." No place.
1689. In *Six Papers*, ed. II.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 188–200.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
1693. In *State Tracts*, II. 274. [Here it is anon.]
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1686. *Reflections on Mr Varillas's History of the Revolutions that have happned in Europe in matters of Religion, and more particularly in his ninth book that relates to England.* By G. Burnet, D.D. Pierre Savouret. Amsterdam. 1686. 12mo.

Appeared in Sept.—Oct., 1686. See Burnet to Fall (*supra*, p. 220), and Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, Oct. 1686 [pp. 1206–1216].

1686. French trans. [by Le Clerc—see Remonstrant's Library, J. 13 e.—R.K. 3, 5, 7, 14]. Reviewed by Bayle in Nov. 1686.
1689. Reprint "by G. Burnet, D.D., London. Printed in the year 1689."
1689. London. In Dr Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. II.

1687. *Some Letters; containing an account of what seemed most remarkable in Switzerland, Italy, etc. Written by G. Burnet to T. H. R. B.* [*The Hon. Robert Boyle.*] *To which is annexed his answer to Mr Varillas.* At Amsterdam. Printed in the year 1686.

Pub. Jan. or Feb. 1686–7 [Bayle]. The *Varillas* is probably a remainder as there are separate title-pages and pagination. Five editions said to have appeared in Holland during first month.

1686[7]. Rotterdam. 12mo. Same title as Amsterdam ed. as far as "T. H. R. B." Then follows: "At Rotterdam. Printed by Abraham Acher, "Bookseller by the Exchange, 1686." [Very badly produced; the type is changed towards the end.]
1687. Abraham Acher, Rotterdam. 2nd ed. corrected. 8vo.
1687. Abraham Acher, Rotterdam. 3rd ed. corrected...to which is added an Appendix...by a person of quality. 12mo.
1687. Amsterdam (Savouret and Fenner). [As *Dr B.'s Travels*, 3 pts.] 12mo.
1687. London.
1687. Rotterdam. [French trans. as *Voyage de Suisse*, etc.] 2 vols. in 1, 12mo. [Abraham Acher.]

1688. The same, 2nd ed.
1688. Amsterdam. (The Widow Swart.) 12mo. (as *Some Letters*), 3rd edition.
1688. Leipzig. [German trans., with the additional Three Letters, ascribed to the "berühmte Englische Theologus," etc.]
1689. London (as *Some Letters*). [With the additions] "corrected and altered...by the Author."
1689. London. In Dr Burnet's Tracts, vol. I. (alternative titles).
1690. [French trans. as *Voyage* (etc.).] Rotterdam. Abraham Acher.
1698. (Trin. Term.) London. Sold by J. Robinson (as *Some Letters*).
1708. 3rd [London ?] ed. corrected. 8vo. (as *Some Letters*).
1718. [French trans. as *Voyage de Suisse*, etc.] 3rd edition. Rotterdam.
1724. London. 8vo. (as *Some Letters*).
1737. [As *Burnet's Travels*.] London. 12mo.
1748. In Harris's *Navigantium atque Itinerantium...Bibliotheca*...vol. II. p. 590.
1750. London.
1752. Edinburgh. 12mo. (as *Travels*).
1764. Harris (another edition).
1772. In John Hamilton Moore's *Voyages*, fol. II. 895.

1687. *Reasons against the Repealing the Acts of Parliament concerning the Test. Humbly offered to...the Members of both Houses, at their meeting on the twenty-eighth of April*, 1687.

Anon. Pub. in Holland before news of prorogation of March $\frac{24}{31}$ known there. First ed. not seen.

1687. In *Six Papers*.
1689. In *Six Papers*. 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, p. 1.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1687. *Some Reflections on His Majesty's Proclamation of the Twelfth of February*, $168\frac{6}{7}$, *for a Toleration in Scotland*....

Anon. Pub. in Holland after Proclamation received there. First ed. not seen.

1687. In *Six Papers*.
1689. In *Six Papers*. 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, p. 10.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
1693. In *State Tracts*, II. 281 [anon.].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1687. *A letter containing some Reflections on His Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience dated the Fourth of April* 1687.

Anon. A Postscript says this was written soon after Proclamation received, but was not immediately pub. First ed. [Holland] not seen.

1687. In *Six Papers*.
1689. In *Six Papers*. 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, p. 25.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[1687.] [*Meditation*] *Upon my second marriage.*

Dated May 25, 1687. First pub. in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, 1902, pp. 520–1.

1687. *A Relation of the Death of the Primitive Persecutors. Written originally in Latin by L. C. F. Lactantius. Englished by Gilbert Burnet, D.D. To which he hath made a large Preface concerning Persecution.* Amsterdam. Printed for J. S., 1687.

It seems to have appeared in June. See *Vindic. Ag. Parl. Pac.* and *Nouv. de la Rép. des Lettres.* (July—Sept.)

1688. Part of Burnet's Pref. *with all attacks on Roman Catholicism carefully omitted.* Repub. as *The Case of Compulsion in matters of Religion stated by G. B. Addressed to the serious consideration of the Members of the Church of England in this present juncture. Licensed August* 21, 1688. London, printed by T. S. [This curious version must have been intended to serve the cause of the King's campaign *against the Tests.*]

1689. Both trans. and pref. included in Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. II.

[**1713**?] An extraordinary production (of which there is a copy in Brit. Mus.) entitled *The Bishop of Salisbury's New Preface to his Pastoral Care Considered.... The second edition.* London. J. Bradford. This is simply *Burnet's own Pref.* to the *Lactantius.* [It is probably the reissue mentioned in *Speculum Sarisburianum.*]

1715. New ed. of trans. and Pref. as *God's Judgments upon tyrants...made English by...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum.... The second edition* 1715.

1687. *The Citation of Gilbert Burnet, D.D....together with his Answer ...and three Letters writ by him....* At the Hague, 1687.

Advt. dated June 27 O.S., 1687. 1st ed. [Holland] not seen, but was in George Johnson's *Catalogue*, 1906.

1687. Dutch trans.
[**1687**?] London ed.?]
1687. French trans.
1687. French trans. in *Recueil des Pièces concernant...l'Angleterre.* Cologne. 1687.
1687. In *Six Papers.*
1689. In *Six Papers*, 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 145–71.
[**1689.**] See Collection *g.*
[**1704.**] See Collection *i.*
1713. Reprinted in *A Collection of Speeches...etc....by Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum, to which is added his Citation...answer and three letters writ by him upon that subject to the Earl of Middletown.*

1687. *An Answer to a Paper printed with Allowance, entitled A New Test of the Church of England's loyalty.*

Anon. First ed. [Holland] not seen.

1687. In *Six Papers.*
1689. In *Six Papers*, 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 45–55.
[**1689.**] See Collection *g.*
[**1704.**] See Collection *i.*

1687. *The Earl of Melfort's Letter to the Presbyterian Ministers in Scotland...together with some Remarks....*

Anon. Pub. after July 1687. First ed. [Holland] not seen.

1687. In *Six Papers*, 1st ed.
1689. In *Six Papers*, 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 56–63.
[**1689.**] See Collection *g.*
[**1704.**] See Collection *i.*

1687. *An Answer to Mr...Payne's letter...to the Author of the Letter to a Dissenter.*

Anon. Probably written in Sept. First ed. [Holland] not seen.

1687. In *Six Papers*, 1st ed.
1689. In *Six Papers*, 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 38–44.
[**1689.**] See Collection *g*.
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1687. *A defence of the Reflections on...Mr Varillas's History of Heresies. Being a reply to his answer.* By G. Burnet, D.D. Amsterdam. Printed for G. S. 1687.

Prob. pub. in Aug. or Sept.

1687. Amsterdam.
1689. Reprinted in Dr Burnet's *Tracts*, 1689. Vol. II.

1687. *A continuation of Reflections on Mr Varillas's History of Heresies, particularly...his third and fourth Tomes.* By G. Burnet, D.D. Amsterdam. Printed for J. S. 1687.

Prob. pub. in Oct., as criticized by Bayle [*Nouv. de la Rép. des Let.*] in Nov.; said to have been written in eight days.

1689. In Dr Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. II.

1687. *Supplement to Dr Burnet's Letters...being Further Remarks... written by a Nobleman of Italy and communicated to the Author which he has since thought fit to publish in Vindication of some passages in the Letters.* Rotterdam. Abraham Acher....1687.

The Brit. Mus. copy is *bound* with the following work. Prob. by Burnet himself; see his obs. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 247.

1689. *Reissue* with title-page dated London 1689. [It is included in subsequent editions of *Letters*.]

1687–8. *Three Letters concerning the present State of Italy....Being a Supplement to Dr Burnet's Letters.* n.p. 1688. 12mo.

Anon. Really drawn up by Burnet from materials provided by H. Sidney and Dr Hutton. [See *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 247.] A trans. of part of first letter had appeared in a *Receuil* on Molinism dated 1688, but reviewed by Bayle Dec. 1687. The *Three Letters* are reviewed by him Feb. 1688.

1688. [London?] 8vo.
1688. French translation. [Cologne.]
1689. In Dr Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. I.
1693. [Leipzig?] German trans. 12mo. as "Die eigentliche Beschreibung des gegenwartigen Zustandes," etc. [F. C. Pretio.]

1688. *Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation, lately printed at Oxford [by Obadiah Walker]. Part I.*

Reflections on the Oxford Theses Relating to the English Reformation. Part II. Amsterdam. Printed for J. S. 1688.

Anon. Mentioned by Lady Russell Feb. 10, 168⅞. First ed. of first part not seen.

1688. Amsterdam. [Anon?]
1688. Amsterdam. [Anon?]

1689. *Reflections, etc. In Two Parts.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D., Chaplain to His Highness the Prince of Orange. London....Chiswell...1689. (To the second part the original title-page, Amsterdam...1688, is left. Pagination continuous.)

[**1689.**] See Collection *g* [no. 19].

[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1688. *An Enquiry into the Reasons for Abrogating the Test...offered by Sa. Oxon.* [n.p. n.d. 4to s. s.]

Written before Parker's death in March. Orig. ed. prob. printed in Holland.

1688. *A second part of the* [*same*] *Enquiry...or an Answer to his Plea for Transubstantiation and for acquitting the Roman Church of Idolatry.*

See last note.

1688. Reprinted in London as *A Discourse Concerning Transubstantiation and Idolatry.*

1688. *A continuation of the second part of the* [*same*] *Enquiry....*

See last note.

1688. All three translated into Dutch.

1688, March. **1688,** April. Two English editions. See Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 34515, ff. 61–2. [Letter from James Johnston, of 4 April.]

1689. Reprinted in *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 200–244.

[**1689.**] See Collection *g*.

[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1748, etc. In *Somer's Tracts.* First edition.

1809–15. In *Somer's Tracts.* Second edition, IX. 151.

1688. *Animadversions upon the Reflections upon Dr B*[*urnet*']*s Travels.* [Amsterdam?] 1688. 12mo.

Answering *Reflexions* [*sic*], licensed March 27, 1688.

1689. In Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. I.

1688. *Reflections on a late Pamphlet entitled Parliamentum Pacificum. Licensed by the Earl of Sunderland and printed at London in March* 1688. By G. B., D.D. Amsterdam. 1688.

Prob. written in April.

1688. Dutch trans. as *Reflectien.* n.p. 1688.

1688. Dutch trans. as *Aenmerkinge.* Bommel. 1688.

1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 65–82.

[**1689.**] See Collection *g*.

[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1688. *Dr Burnet's Vindication of Himself from the Calumnies* [*of*] *Parliamentum Pacificum.*

Orig. ed. [Holland] not seen.

1688. French. trans. [Amsterdam?].

1688. Dutch trans. as *Reflectien.* n.p. 1688.

1688. Dutch trans. as *Aenmerkinge.* Bommel. 1688.

1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 172–88.

[**1689.**] See Collection *g*.

[**1704?**] See Collection *i*.

1713. See Collection *j*.

1688. *A Letter to Mr Thevenot containing a Censure of M. le Grand's History of K. Henry the Eighth's Divorce* [signed G. Burnet].

Dated May 10, 1688, and orig. pub. in the *Bibliothéque Universelle.*

[1688?] French trans. dated June 30 [the Hague?].
1688. French trans. repr. with remarks by Le Grand, license dated Aug. 12, Paris.
1689. Repub. in England with the censures on Bossuet [dated Sept. 10, 1688], Easter Term, 1689, before Burnet's elevation to the Episcopate. [London. Starkey and Chiswell.]
1689. Repub. in Dr Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. II.
[1689.] See Collection *g* [no. 20].
[1690?] Republished (with a translation of Le Grand's *History*); apparently retranslated from French translation, as it is dated *June*. No title-page.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1688. *An Apology for the Church of England with relation to the Spirit of Persecution for which she is accused.*

Pub. apparently just after Seven Bishops' Trial. Anon. Orig. ed. [Holland] not seen.

1688. French trans. [Amsterdam?].
1688. Dutch trans. [Amsterdam?].
1689. In *Six Papers*, 2nd ed.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 83–96.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1748, etc. In *Somer's Tracts*.
1809, etc. *Ibid.* ed. II.

1688. *Some Extracts out of Mr James Stewart's Letters....Together with some references to Master Stewart's printed Letter.*

Written in June. Orig. ed. [Holland] not seen.

1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 97–109.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1688. *An Edict in the Roman Law in the* 25 *Book of the Digests, Title* 4, *Sect.* 10...[concerning posthumous births].

First ed. [Holland] not seen.

1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 110–18.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1688. *A Censure of M. de Meaux* [*Bossuet's*] *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches; Together with some further Reflections on M. le Grand.*

Dated at the Hague, Sept. 10, 1688, and signed G. Burnet. 1st ed. [Holland] not seen.

1689. Pub. in London with the Letter to Thevenot under date 1689. (See *Letter* to Thevenot, *supra.*)
1689. French. trans., Amster. 1689.
1689. Repr. in Dr Burnet's *Tracts*, vol. II.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1688. *An Enquiry into the measures of submission to the Supreme Authority; and of the grounds upon which it may be lawful or necessary for Subjects to defend their Religion, Lives and Liberties.* n. d. or p.

Prob. pr. in Holland.

[1688?] Eng ed., no p. or d.
1688. Dutch trans., Amsterdam.
1688. London, printed in the year 1688 [George Johnston's *Catalogue of English Tracts*, 1906 (33 George St., Edinburgh), p. 23].
1688. [Edin.?], printed in the year 1688. [George Johnston's *Catalogue of Rare Scottish Tracts*, 1906, where his copy is said to be one of the only two known.]
1689. Dutch trans.
1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 119–32.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
1693. In *State Tracts*, II. 483.
1693. *An Enquiry [etc.] writ at the time of his Majesty's coming to England... and now reprinted with a Preface....* By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum [published on occasion of the burning of the Pastoral Letter].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1744. In *Harl. Misc.*
1808, etc. In same, 2nd ed.

[1688.] *A Meditation on my Voyage for England...[intended] for my last Words in case this Expedition should prove disastrous....*

First pub. in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, 1902, pp. 522–8.

1688. *A Letter to a Lord, upon his happy conversion from Popery to the Protestant Religion.* By G. Burnet, D.D. Printed in the year 1688.

No place. Signed G. B. Badly printed; seems to have been written during Revolution (7th Dec. 1688).

1688. *A Review of the Reflections on the Prince of Orange's Declaration.*

Apparently pr. in England after landing of the Prince's expedition, but where does not appear.

1689. In *Eighteen Papers*, pp. 133–44.
[1689.] See Collection *g*.
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[1688.] [*A Paper on Ecclesiastical Policy, addressed to the Prince of Orange.*]

Written either at Windsor or Sion, on the way to London. Printed by Blencowe, in *Diary of...Henry Sidney*...1843. Vol. II., 281–8.

[1688.] *Memorandum concerning the King.*

On the Regency question. Written before Dec. 24, 1688, when the King left Rochester [see on this point, *Corrigenda, supra*]. Printed by Blencowe, in *Diary of...Henry Sidney*...1843. Vol. II., 288–91.

1688. *A Sermon preached in the Chappel of St James's before His Highness the Prince of Orange the 23d of December*, 1688. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D., Chaplain to His Highness. Printed by His Highness's special command....London...Chiswell...1689 [on Ps. cxviii. 23].

Pub. Eas. Term, 1689.

1689. London, 2nd ed.
1689. London, another ed.

1689. Edinburgh, Reprinted in the year 1689.
1689. Dutch trans., Amsterdam.
1689. French trans., Pierre Savouret, Amsterdam.
1689. German ed. [Hamburg?] as the work "Des berühmten Englischen Theologi. D. G. Burnet."
[1689.] See Collection *g* [no. 23].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1688. *Reflections on a Paper entituled, his Majesty's Reasons for withdrawing himself from Rochester.* Published by Authority. London... Chiswell...1689.

Anon. Eas. Term, 1689.

1689. London, another ed.
1689. Dutch trans.
[1689.] See Collection *g* [no. 22].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1705, etc. Included in *State Tracts*, I. 126.

1689. *An Enquiry into the present state of Affairs; and in particular, Whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? And whether we are bound to treat with Him and call Him back again or not?* Published by Authority. London...Starkey; and...Chiswell...1689.

Eas. Term, 1689. Anon.

1689. Edinburgh.
1689. Another ed.
1689. Dutch trans.
1689. Another Dutch trans.
[1689.] See Collection *g* [no. 21].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1705. In *State Tracts*, I. 128.

1689. *A Sermon preached before the House of Commons on the 31st of January* 1688. *Being the Thanksgiving for the deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power, by his Highness the Prince of Orange's means.* By Gilbert Burnet, D.D., and Chaplain to his Highness. London... Starkey; and...Chiswell...1689 [Ps. cxliv. 15].

Eas. Term, 1689. Printed by desire of the House of Commons.

1689. 2nd ed., London.
1689. Dutch trans., de Weduwe van Steven Swart [Amsterdam].
1689. French trans., Pierre Savouret [Amsterdam].
1689. French trans., Chiswell, London.
[1689.] See Collection *g* [no. 24].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[1689.] *A Meditation on my Consecration...*

Dated Eas. Eve, March 30, 1689. First printed in *Supplement*, 1902, p. 537–40.

1689. *A Sermon preached at the Coronation of William III and Mary II...April* 11, 1689. By Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Salisbury. Printed by their Majesties' Special Command. London...Starkey; and... Chiswell...1689 [on 2 Sam. xxiii. 3–4].

Eas. Term, 1689. ["Scotland" in the Royal style is represented by dashes.]

1689. Another ed., Chiswell, London.
1689. Edinburgh, Reprinted in the year 1689. Only two copies known. [Johnston's *Catalogue of Rare Scottish Tracts before* 1700, pub. 1906.]

1689. French trans. [Amsterdam].
1689. German trans., Hamburg (with a plate representing House of Lords).
1689. German trans. by Happel, Hamburg, in *Fortuna Brittaniæ*.
[**1689.**] (English version.) See Collection *g* [no. 25].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1689. *A pastoral Letter writ by...Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum to the Clergy of his Diocese concerning the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to K[ing] William and Q[ueen] Mary.* London...Starkey; and...Chiswell... 1689.

Dated May 15, licensed May 16.

1689. Edinburgh, Reprinted in the year 1689 [G. Johnston's *Catalogue*, 1906].
1689. Dutch trans., Weduwe van Steven Swart, Amsterdam.
[**1689.**] See Collection *g* [no. 26].
[**1693?**] Reprint? after burning of *Letter*? not seen, but said to have existed.
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

[1689.] *The first Fast-Sermon preached at Hampton Court, before K[ing] William and Q[ueen] Mary, on the first Wednesday in June* [1689] *...for imploring a blessing on the War then begun...*[on 2 Chron. xv. 2].

Not pub. till 1713 in *Some Sermons, etc.*, by Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Churchill...1713. p. 1.

1689. *A Sermon preached before the House of Peers in the Abbey of Westminster on the 5th of November*, 1689....By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1689 [Micah vi. 5].

Pub. Hil. Term, 1690.

[**1689.**] See Collection *g* [no. 27].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1689. *An Exhortation to Peace and Unity: in a Sermon preached at St Lawrence-Jury...26...Novemb.* 1689. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1689 [Acts vii. 16].

Hil. Term, 1689–90. Licensed Nov. 29. The heading reads "Union" (for Unity).

1689. [Title-headings and no imprint, G. Johnston's *Catalogue of Rare Scottish Tracts*, 1906.]
[**1689?**] Another ed. [Mentioned in Brit. Mus. Catalogue.]
[**1689.**] See Collection *g* [no. 28].
1690. 2nd ed., London.
1702. Dublin [not seen, as British Museum copy mislaid. Identification conjectural, being obviously misplaced in Catalogue].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1689. *A Sermon preached before the King and Queen at Whitehall on Christmas Day*, 1689. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1690 [1 Tim. iii. 16].

Printed by their Majesties' Special Command. Hil. Term, 1690.

[**1689.**] See Collection *g* [no. 29].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1689–90. *A Sermon preached at Bow-Church before the Court of Aldermen on March* 12, $16\frac{8}{90}$. *Being the Fast-Day*....By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1690 [on Luke xix. 41, 42].

Printed by desire. Trin. Term, 1690.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 1].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[**1690.**] *An Essay towards a new Book of Homilies, In seven Sermons, Prepared at the Desire of Archbishop Tillotson, and some other Bishops.*

Not pub. till 1713 in *Some Sermons*...by...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Churchill...1713, pp. 191–349. 8vo.

1742. Reprinted without the Preface in *Select Sermons*...by Gilbert Burnett, D.D. Sometime Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, afterwards Bishop of Sarum. 12mo. [Sermons 1–7 (pp. 1–128).]

1690. *Injunctions for the Archdeacons of the Diocese of Sarum. To be delivered by them to the Clergy in their Easter Visitations* 1690. *Together with a Letter from their Diocesan Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum.* London... Chiswell...1690.

Dated April 22, 1690. Licensed April 30, 1690.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 1 (*a*)].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1690. *A Sermon preached before the Queen at Whitehall on the 16th Day of July*, 1690. *Being the Monthly Fast.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1690 [on Ps. lxxxv. 8].

Mich. Term, 1690 [printed by her Majesty's command].

[1691?] Eas. Term. Another edition? or merely a second reference to the first? see Prof. Arber's *Term Catalogue*, II. 357.
[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 2].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1842. Reprinted with the [*Essay on the Late Queen or*] *Memorial of Mary... Queen Consort to King William III.*

1690. *A short Directory concerning proper Rules how to prepare young Persons for Confirmation.* 4to. 1690.

Given in Flexman's list, but not seen by present writer.

1690. *A Sermon preached before the King and Queen at Whitehall on the 19th Day of October*, 1690. *Being the Day of Thanksgiving for His Majesty's Preservation and Success in Ireland.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1690 [Ps. cxliv. 10, 11].

Mich. Term, 1690.

1690. 2nd ed.
[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 3].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1690–1. *A Sermon preached at the Funeral of the Right Honourable Anne Lady Dowager Brook...19th...February*, $169\frac{0}{1}$. By...Gilbert... Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1691 [Prov. xxxi. 30–1].

Imprimatur Feb. 21, $169\frac{0}{1}$. Eas. Term, 1691.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 4].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1691. *A Sermon preached at Whitehall before the King and Queen on the 29th of April, 1691. Being the Fast Day.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1691 [Ps. xii. 1].

Published by command. Eas. Term, 1691.

[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 5].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1691. *A Sermon preached at Whitehall...26...Novemb.*, 1691. *Being the Thanksgiving Day for the Preservation of the King, and the reduction of Ireland.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1691 [Prov. xx. 28].

Printed by command. Mich. Term, 1691.

1691. Another ed., London.
[**1692?**] It is mentioned under head of Eas. Term, 1692, in *Term Catalogues*.
[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 6].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1691–2. *A Sermon preached at the Funeral of the Honourable Robert Boyle...January 7*, 1691–2. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Chiswell...1692 [Eccles. ii. 26].

Eas. Term, 1692.

[**1692?**] Another ed.? (The tract reappears in *Term Catalogue* for Trin. Term, 1692.)
1696. Latin trans. app. by Jablonski to his trans. of Bentley's *Boyle Lectures* ("Stultitia...Atheismi").
[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 7].
1704. A second edition, included in at least some copies of following collection.
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.
1737. Extracts in Budgell's *Memoirs...of the Boyles*.
1742. In *Select Sermons*, Foulis, Glasgow, 1742, pp. 173–212.
1833, 1833. In [Knox and] Jebb's *Lives, Characters, etc. of Burnet*, 1st. Lon., 2nd Lon. editions only.

1692. *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care*....By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1692. 4to.

Imprimatur May 5, 1692. Pub. in Mich. Term.

1692. 2nd ed. London...Chiswell. 8vo.
1713. 3rd ed.: "With a new preface suited to the present Time; and some "other Additions." London...Midwinter...and Benj. Cowse, 1713. 8vo.
1713. 4th ed. [London...Midwinter...and Cowse]. 8vo.
1726. 4th ed., Dublin ["with additions" but without the new Preface]. 12mo.
1736. "4th ed." London [with the new Preface]. 8vo.
1762. New ed., Glasgow [with the new Preface]. 16mo.
1766. 5th ed., London. 8vo.
1777. [With Burnet's advice to the Clergy from Conclusion of History, and his "Character by Halifax."] Dublin [with the new Preface]. 12mo.
1805. 12th ed., London [with the new Preface]. 12mo.
1807, 1814, 1824, 1827, 1843, 1855. In the *Clergyman's Instructor*, Clarendon Press, editions 1–5[1].
1818. 13th ed., London. 12mo.

[1] This work is sometimes found with the title-page cancelled and the imprint of other firms, who had acquired an interest. One of these (Macmillan) bears date **1863.** (Note kindly inspired by Mr Doble.)

1821. 14th ed., London. 12mo. [With Life of Author.]
1840. Annotated by Rev. T. Dale. 12mo.
1853. New edition of preceding.
1873. 15th ed. *Pastoral Care.* London.

[1692.] *A Sermon prepared...to be preached on the Thanksgiving Day for the Victory at...La Hogue; but not preached* [on Exodus xiv. 13].

First pub. in *Some Sermons*, 1713, p. 45.

1693. *A Letter writ by the...Bishop of Salisbury to the...Bishop of Cov*[*entry*] *and Litchfield concerning a Book* [criticising *Hist. Reformation*], *by Anthony Harmer.* London...Chiswell...1693.

Licensed March 6, 169⅔. Pub. Eas. Term, 1693.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 8].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1693–4. *A* [*Lent*] *Sermon preached before the Queen at Whitehall on... 11...March*, 169⅔...By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell... 1694 [1 Cor. i. 26].

Printed by Command, Eas. Term, 1694.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 9].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1694. *Four Discourses...to the Clergy of the Diocese of Sarum....*By... Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1694.

Eas. Term, 1694.

1694. Another ed.
1743. [First discourse only with Locke, *On Miracles*, as *A Treatise concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion.*]

1694. *A Sermon preached before the Queen at Whitehall on the 29th of May*, 1694, *being the Anniversary of King Charles II his Birth and Restauration.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1694 [Ps. cv. 5].

Printed by Command, Trin. Term, 1694, but reappears in Catalogue for Mich. Term.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 10].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1694. *A Sermon preached at the Funeral of...John...Archbishop of Canterbury...Nov....*30...1694. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Chiswell...1694 [2 Tim. iv. 7].

Pub. Trin. Term.

1694. Edinburgh.
1694. Dublin.
[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 11].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.
1709. London.

1695. [*A Vindication* [*of Tillotson and Stillingfleet*] *from a late Socinian Book...*"*Considerations on...the Doctrine of the Trinity.*" *To which is added*] *A Letter from the...Bishop of Sarum to the Author of the said Vindication* [*Dr Williams*]. London...Chiswell...1695.

Eas. Term, 1695. Letter dated Feb. 2, 169⅔.

1694–5. *A [Lent] Sermon preached before the King at St James-Chappel on the 10th of February*, 1694–5....By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London ...Chiswell...1695 [2 Cor. vi. 1].

Pub. by Command, Eas. Term, 1695.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 12].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1695. *An Essay on the Memory of the late Queen.* By Gilbert Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1695. 8vo.

Eas. Term, 1695.

1695. Edinburgh.
1695. Dublin.
1695. French trans. by Dr Mezel, Hague (see Kippis *Biog. Brit.*).
1695. Dutch trans. by J. G. Pritius, Leipzig (*ibid.*).
1696. 2nd ed., London.
1716. French trans., La Haye. 12mo.
1774. [With *Lives* of Hale and Rochester, etc.] London.
1842. As *Memorials of Mary Princess of Orange Queen Consort to King William III.* Edinburgh. [With her letters, and a sermon of Burnet's. July 16, 1690 q.v.]

1695. *Animadversions on Mr Hill's...Vindication of the primitive Fathers against...Gilbert Bishop...of Sarum. In a Letter to a Person of Quality.* London...Chiswell...1695.

Dated April 12, 1695. Pub. in Trin. Term. Anon. but ascribed to Burnet.

1696. *Reflections upon a Pamphlet entituled* [*Some Discourses upon Dr Burnet and Dr Tillotson...*]. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Chiswell...1696.

[Alternative title in half-title and headline, *The Bishop of Sarum's Vindication.* Not traced in *Term Cat.*]

[Jan. 1696. Qu. 1696–7.] *Memorial concerning the First Fruits and Tenths. Given in to the King in January*, 1696.

First pr. 1734 in the *Life* by son, appended *Hist. Own Time*, [fol. pag.], II. 713.
Repub. with subsequent ed. of *Hist.*

1696–7. *A Sermon preached before the King at Whitehall on Christmas-Day*, 1696. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1697 [Gal. iv. 4].

Printed by command. Hil. Term, 1696–7.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 13].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1696–7. *A Sermon preached before the King...at Whitehall on the third Sunday in Lent...7...March*, 1696–7. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1697 [Ephes. v. 2].

Printed by command. Trin. Term, 1697.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 14].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[1697.] *A Memorial drawn up by King William's special Direction. Intended to be given in at the Treaty of Ryswick....In answer to Two Memorials that were offered there in King James's name.* London... Chiswell...1705. [Anon.]

Not mentioned by Flexman. The Preface says: "These papers were...drawn up "by the late king's own directions, he explaining himself upon every particular...and "by his orders it was carried to some of the wisest and worthiest Ministers that our "nation has produced in this age; and...carefully corrected by them." [Cf. with this *Vernon Corres.* I. 202, 228 (Feb. 9, May 4, 1696–7); wherein Vernon says Burnet is answering a memorial of James II, and that Shrewsbury, the Lord Chancellor and the Lord Chamberlain think his answer must be anonymous. See also Kippis, *Biog. Brit.* III. 37.] The circumstances of its suppression are given below. The preface adds that the original draught is now published, because the legitimacy of the Revolution is called in question. The pamphlet is in Burnet's style.

1715. Edition by Burleigh, London, not seen.
1748, etc. *Somer's Tracts,* ed. I.
1809, etc. *Somer's Tracts,* ed. II, XI. 103.

[1697.] *The Revolution Vindicated, in an Answer to the Two Memorials...published in the late King James's name....Published from the Manuscript.* [Anon.]

Only published in *State Tracts,* 1705, as an addendum, III. 694–728. Evidently the paper described in the preface to last item; which says that at the last moment the draught to which that preface is a prelude "was ordered to be written over again "not in the king's name, but as the answer of a private person." Eventually this revision was also laid aside. Whole paragraphs are identical with those of the preceding paper.

1697. *A Sermon preach'd before the King at Whitehall...2...December, 1697, being the Day of Thanksgiving for the Peace.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. Published by His Majesty's Special Command. London... Chiswell...1697 [2 Chron. ix. 8].

Mich. Term.

1697. Edinburgh.
1698. 2nd ed. [Chiswell].
[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 15].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i.*

[1697.] *A second Memorial concerning the Tenths and First Fruits. Given in to the King in December,* 1697.

First pr. 1734 in *Life* appended by son to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 714.

Republished with subsequent editions of *Hist. Own Time.*

1698. *Of Charity to the Household of Faith. A Sermon preach'd before the Lord Mayor, the Aldermen, and Governors of the several Hospitals of the City, at St Bridget's Church on Easter Monday,* 1698. *Being one of the Anniversary Spittal Sermons.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1698 [Gal. vi. 10].

Published by desire. Eas. Term.

[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 16].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i.*

1699. *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England.* Written by Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell. 1699 [fol.].

Mich. Term, 1699.

1700. 2nd ed. corrected in *Term Cat.* Trin. Term, 1701. Chiswell, London.
1701. Dublin reprint.
1705. 3rd ed. Chiswell, London.
[1706? Latin ed.?] See Leibnitz.
1720. 4th ed. London.
1737. "4th ed." London (probably a remainder, with new title-page).
} fol.

1746. 5th ed. London.
1759. 6th ed. London.
1796. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
1805. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
1814. [Clarendon Press?] Oxford.
1831. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
1837. "Revised and corrected with copious notes and additional references by...Rev. J. R. Page."
1839. Ed. by Page [London Library Cat.].
1841. With Appendix and notes by Page.
1843. London [?], ed. Page.
1845. Clarendon Press. Oxford.
1846. Ed. Page. [Oxford?]
1850. London.
} 8vo.

1699. [*His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury's Letter to the... Bishops of his Province, To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Sarum*] (covering letter from Burnet to his Archdeacons on last page). London. Printed by Charles Bell and the Executrix of Thomas Newcomb, deceas'd, Printers to the King...1699.

On the Reformation of Manners and the Societies. Probably inspired by Burnet, who endorses contents in covering letter.

1700. *Charitable Reproof. A Sermon preached at...St Mary-le-Bow to the Societies for the Reformation of Manners the 25th of March,* 1700. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. Published at the request of the said Societies. London...Chiswell...1700 [on Prov. xxvii. 5, 6].

First appears in *Term Cat.*, Trin. Term, 1701.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 17].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

1700. *Reflections on a Book entitled* [*The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation, Stated and Vindicated*]. By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1700.

Dated Salisbury, 25 May, 1700. First mentioned in *Term Cat.*, Trin. Term, 1701.

[1703.] See Collection *h* [no. 18].
[1704.] See Collection *i*.

[1701–2.] *The first Sermon preached before the Queen, upon her Accession to the Throne, at St James's Chappel, in Lent, on the 15th day of March,* 1701–2 [Isaiah xlix. 23].

Only pub. in *Some Sermons preached on Several Occasions...*1713, pp. 83–105.

1702. *Remarks on the Examination of the Exposition of the Second Article of our Church.* By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1702.

Eas. Term.

1702. Dublin.
[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 19].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1703–4. *The Bishop of Salisbury's Speech in the House of Lords, upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity* [Dec. 1, 1703]. London...Chiswell ...1704. Price Two-pence.

[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 20].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.
1704. Dublin.
1713. See Collection *j*.

1704. *A Sermon preach'd at St James's Church upon the reading the Brief for the persecuted Exiles of the Principality of Orange.* By...Gilbert... Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1704 [1 Cor. xii. 26, 27].

Lowndes says this was preached in January.

[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 21].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1704. *Of the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. A Sermon preach'd at St Mary-le-Bow, Feb.* 18, 170$\frac{3}{4}$. *Before the Society incorporated for that Purpose. Exhorting all Persons in their Stations, to assist so Glorious a Design.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Brown... and...Sympson...1704 [on Mal. i. 11].

Printed by desire.

[**1703.**] See Collection *h* [no. 22].
[**1704.**] See Collection *i*.

1704. *A Charge given at the Triennial Visitation...in October* 1704. *To which is added a Sermon* [*on Phil.* ii. 1, 2] *preach'd at Salisbury and other Places, in the Visitation.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. [2 pts.] London...Chiswell...1704.

Separate and Common title-pages. The Sermon is sometimes found alone.

1705. *A Sermon concerning Death. Preached in the Cathedral of Salisbury* [Aug. 7, 1705, on occasion of the death of Dean Young]. [Eccles. xii. 7.]

Pub. first in *Some Sermons...*1713, pp. 171–90.

1742. Republished in *Select Sermons...by Gilbert Burnett, D.D., Sometime Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, afterwards Bishop of Sarum.* Glasgow...1742 [pp. 155–71].

1705–6. *A Sermon preached in Lent at the Chapel of St James's on the* 10*th day of March,* 1705–6. By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Chiswell...1706 [on Ps. xlix. 20].

1706. *Because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold. A Sermon preached* [*before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen*] *at St Sepulchre's Church on Easter Monday*, 1706. *Being one of the Anniversary Spittal Sermons.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell... 1706 [on Matt. xxiv. 12].

1706. *A Sermon preached at the Cathedral Church of Salisbury* [June 27, 1706; the Thanksgiving-Day for the successes given to the Queen and her Allies in France and Spain]. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London ...Chiswell...1706 [on Deut. iv. 6–8].

1706. 2nd ed.

1706–7. *A Sermon preached before the Queen and the Two Houses of Parliament at St Paul's,...31...December* 1706, *the Day of Thanksgiving for the wonderful Successes of this Year.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. Printed by his Majesty's special command. London. Printed...for A. and J. Churchill...1707 [Ps. lxxii. 4]. 8vo.

1707. Three other editions same year. (London.)
1707. Dublin.
[There was also a French ed.—not seen.]

1707. [*A Discourse concerning a guide in Controversies; in two Letters: Written to one of the Church of Rome, by a person lately converted from that Communion.*] Preface.

"Bishop Burnet wrote the preface to them, tho' without his name to it." This anonymous work was written by Catherine Trotter, who married, in 1708, the Reverend Patrick, son of Dr Cockburn. See her *Works*, 1751, vol. I. pp. xxix–xxx. The first ed. has not been seen.

1728. 2nd ed. Edinburgh.
1751. In Mrs Catherine Cockburn's *Works*, I. 3.

1708. *A Letter from the Bishop of Salisbury to the Clergy of his Diocese: to be read at the Triennial Visitation in April and May*, 1708. [No place or date.]

Dated London, 15 April, 1708.

1709. [*A Method of Devotion...by Mrs Burnet, late wife of...Gilbert ...Bishop of Sarum. To which is added*] *some account of her Life* [by T. Goodwyn, Archdeacon of Oxford]. London...Downing...Smith and... Barker, 1709.

Burnet says "I dictated [this] for the most part...Dr Godwyn [*sic*]...only writing "so much of it as to give him a right to set his name to it, at my desire." *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, p. 509.

1709–10. *The Bishop of Salisbury his Speech in the House of Lords* [16 March, $17\frac{09}{10}$] *upon the first Article of the Impeachment of Dr Henry Sacheverell.* London. Printed in the year 1710. 8vo. [Price twopence.]

1710. Dublin.
1710. Reprinted with speeches of Bishops of Oxford, Lincoln and Norwich, 4 pts [separate title-pages, two registers and paginations]. Morphew, London, 1710.

1710. Reprint of same.
1710. Reprint of same.
1710. Reprint of same.
1713. See Collection *j*.
1806, etc. Reprinted by Cobbett, *Parl. Hist.* VI. 847–60.

1710. *A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury on the 29th Day of May in the Year* 1710. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London. Printed by J. M. for J. Churchill...1710 [on Matt. xxii. 21].

1711. London. 4to.

[1710.] Kippis in *Biog. Brit.* III. 37 says Burnet wrote a piece on the Gertruydenburg Conference. This I have not seen or identified. It is not in Flexman's own list, though he quotes Kippis' language in its Postscript.

1710. *An Exposition of the Church Catechism for the Use of the Diocese of Sarum.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Churchill...1710. 8vo.

1710. *Two Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church of Salisbury... on the fifth of November...[and] the seventh of November being the Thanksgiving-Day; in the year* 1710. By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London ...John Churchill, 1710. Price threepence [on Ps. cxliv. 15].

1710. 2nd ed. corrected. London.

[1710.] *Rough Draught of my own Life.*

Dated Nov. 30, 1710. First published in *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, 1902, pp. 450–514.

[1710–11.] [*Four*] *Letters which pass'd between the Lord Bishop of Sarum and Mr Henry Dodwell. Printed from the Originals*....London...Richard Smith at the...Bishop Beveridge's Head...1713. [Price sixpence.]

The correspondence began Feb. 13, 1710–11; and the two first letters were printed surreptitiously before Sept. 1712 as *A Letter from the learned Mr Dodwell to the Right Reverend the Bishop of Sarum in which he owns his spiritual Character but not his temporal. Together with the Bishop's Answer.* London...Baker...1712. The authoritative ed. described above has a preface by Nelson, dated 9th April, 1713. Hearne mentions it in May, 1713.

1713. 2nd ed. of *Four Letters* within the month. [Hearne, May 17, 1713.]
1713. Burnet's first letter reprinted in Collection *j*.

1711. *A Sermon preached at St Bride's before the Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen on Monday in Easter-Week*, 1711. By...Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum. London...John Churchill, 1711 [on Ps. cxxii. 6–9].

1711. *A Letter from the Bishop of Sarum to the Clergy of his Diocese to be read at the Triennial Visitation in May*, 1711. [No title-page.] London. 1711.

1713. *The new Preface and additional Chapter to the third edition of the Pastoral Care.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. Publish'd singly for the use of those who have the former edition. London...Midwinter... and Cowse....Sold by Baldwin...1713. [Price sixpence.]

1713. With 3rd ed. *Pastoral Care* [this no doubt preceded above].
1713. With 4th ed. *Pastoral Care.* [For further ed. see *Pastoral Care*, 1694.]
1713. See Collection *j*.

1713. The Preface [to *Some Sermons preached on several Occasions and an Essay towards a new Book of Homilies*....By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...Churchill...1713].

1713. See Collection *j*.
1746. Reprinted with the *Sermon concerning Popery*, contained in the same volume, q. v. sub. 1683.

1713. *An Introduction to the Third Volume of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England*....By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum... Churchill...1713.

Prefatory letter dated Sept. 26, 1713.
1714. 2nd ed.
1715. Part of this inserted in *The Justice and Necessity of Restraining the Clergy in their Preaching.*

1714. *A Sermon preached at St Bridget's Church on Monday in Easter Week March* 29, 1714 *before...the Lord Mayor* [*etc.*] *and the Governors of the several Hospitals of the City.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London ...J. Churchill...1714 [on Dan. iv. 27].

1714. Edinburgh. 12mo.

1714. *A Sermon preach'd, and a Charge given at the Triennial Visitation of the Diocese of Salisbury.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London... Churchill...1714 [on Acts xx. 32].

1714. *A Sermon preached before his Majesty King George at his Royal Chappel of St James's; on Sunday the 31st of Octob.* 1714. By...Gilbert... Bishop of Sarum. Published by his Majesty's special command. London... Churchill...1714 [on Ps. ii. 10, 11].

1714. *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. The third Part. Being a Supplement to the Two Volumes formerly published.* By...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. London...J. Churchill...1715.

1715. 2nd ed. London.
1753. London.
Editions of whole work[1].
1730–33. Dublin, fol.
1764–69. German ed. Brunswick.
1816. Oxford, 6 vols. in 3, 8vo.
1820. London, 6 vols. in 3, 8vo.
1825. London. Sm. 8vo. 6 vols. in 3, 8vo.

[1] The Bibliography of this is very confusing as complete sets were originally formed from remainders of early editions, vol. I., II., combined with various editions, vol. III.

1829. Clarendon Press, Oxford ed. Nares, 4 vols. 4to.
1838. London, 4 vols. 8vo.
1839. London ed. Nares, 4 vols. 8vo.
1841. London, 2 vols. 8vo.
1850. London, 2 vols. 8vo.
1857. [London?] 2 vols. 8vo.
1865. *Oxford* (*definitive ed.*) ed. Nicholas Pocock.
1873. London.
1880. London, 2 vols. 8vo.

1715. [*A Character of...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum with*] *a true Copy of his last Will and Testament containing* I. *His profession of Faith.* II. *His Charitable Benefactions.* III. *An account of the History of his Life and Times with Directions for the publication of that and other Manuscripts, &c.* London ...J. Roberts...1715. [Price sixpence.]

1715. 2nd ed. London.
1715. 3rd ed. London.
1717. 4th ed. London (of Will, with his monumental inscription but without the character).
1728. In *Lives and Last Wills...of...eminent persons.* London...H. Curll... 1728.

1719. *An Abridgment of the Third Volume of the History of the Reformation.* By Gilbert Burnet, M.A., Chaplain in ordinary to his Majesty[1]. Being a Supplement to the two former volumes. London... W. Churchill. 1719. 12mo.

Issued with 5th ed. of earlier part (2 vols. 12mo.).

1728. *Abridgment of whole work.* London, 2nd ed. 12mo. [With 6th ed. of 1st vols.]
1808. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
1847. London [ed. Corrie].
1872. London.
1903. London.

1723–4. *Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Time.* Vol. I. From the Restoration of King Charles II to the Settlement of King William and Queen Mary at the Revolution: to which is prefixed a summary recapitulation of affairs in Church and State from King James I to the Restoration in the year 1660. London. Printed for Thomas Ward in the Inner Temple Lane. 1724. fol.

1724. Reprinted Dublin.
1725. Johnson, Hague, 3 vols. Surreptitious ed. (see Lowndes).
1725. London, Printed for the Company of Booksellers, 3 vols. 8vo.
1725. Dutch trans., 4 vols. Gravenhage. 1725.
1725. French trans., *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la grande Bretagne* etc. 3 vols. 12mo. La Haye.
1725. French trans., *Histoire des dernières revolutions d'Angleterre.* La Haye. 2 vols in 1, 4to.
1727. Same title. La Haye. 4 vols. 12mo.
Abridgments.
1724. London [by Stackhouse].
1724. London [*An Impartial Examination*, containing an *Abridgment*].

[1] The Bishop's second son.

1733–4. *Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Time.* Vol. II. From the Revolution to the Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht in the Reign of Queen Anne. To which is added the Author's Life, by the Editor. London. Printed for the Editor by Joseph Downing in Bartholomew Close, and Henry Woodfall in the Strand. 1734. fol.

1734. Johnson, Hague, 3 vols. Surreptitious ed. (see Lowndes).
1734. Dublin.
1734. London, 3 vols. 8vo. (see 1st. vol. 1725 ed. London).

Subsequent editions of whole work.

1735. French trans., as *Histoire de ce qui s'est passé...pendant sa vie.* La Haye. 2 vols. in 4 (4to.).
1753. London, 4 vols. 8vo. ed. Flexman, who appended his list of *Works.*
1753. Edinburgh, 6 vols. 12mo.
1766. London, 3rd ed. 4 vols. 8vo. (with editorial notes).
1809. London, 4 vols. 8vo.
1815. London, 4 vols. 8vo.
1818. London, 4 vols.
1823. Clarendon Press, *Oxford, ed. Routh, 7 vols. 8vo. suppressed passages restored.*
1824. French trans., Guizot, 4 vols. 8vo.
1827. French trans. in [Guizot's] *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à la Révolution d'Angleterre*, vols. 17–20.
1833. *Second edition, enlarged, Oxford, of Routh's ed.* 1823, 6 vols. 8vo.
1838. New ed. with notes. London.
1839. London, 1 vol. 8vo. (sometimes divided into two).
1840. London, 2 vols. 4to.
1852. [Reign of James II only, ed. Routh, from the Bodleian autograph.]
1857. London (Bohn).
1883. London, 8vo.
1897, etc. *Oxford, ed. Airy, vols. 1 and 2.* [*Reign of Charles*] (in progress). [*Conclusion only.*]
1734. London, 8vo.
1734. London [another ed.], 8vo.
1735. Tewkesbury.
1751. London.
1781. In French and English under title *To the generous English Nobility.* London.

[*Extracts from Conclusion.*]

1760. Annual Register, vol. III. pt 2, p. 181.
[1770? London?] As *Bishop Burnet's Exhortation to All Mankind.*
1803, 1815, 1824, 1833, 1833. In Jebb's *Lives* with extract from *Hist.* See *supra*, 1680, *Life* of Rochester.
1813. London, 12mo.
1856. As *An Exhortation to the Practice of Religion*, no. 35 of Tracts published by the Society of Friends.

Abridgments of whole work.

1874. *The History of his Own Time*, by the Rev. Gilbert Burnet, D.D. sometime Bishop of Salisbury. Abridged by the Author [*sic*] for the use of Students...new edition, London...n.d. This is founded on Stackhouse. London.
1903. London.
1906. London.

1902. [*A Supplement to Burnet's History of my Own Times derived from*] *his original Memoirs* [*etc.*]. Ed. by...H. C. Foxcroft...Oxford.

The other items in this work are given in their chronological order.

COLLECTIONS OF BURNET'S FUGITIVE PIECES (QUOTED IN PRECEDING LIST).

(*a*) **1685.** *A Collection of several Tracts and Discourses written in the years* 1677[—]1685. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. London...Chiswell... 1685. 4to.

[This collection appears to be a mere series of "remainders" bound together, sometimes with addition of the *Hist. Powd. Treas.*, and its accompanying Tract (in the ed. of 1688). The "remainder" *of the Collection* seems to have been *reissued* in 1704 as vol. I. of *A Collection...in Three Volumes*, q.v. *infra* (i).]

(*b*) **1687.** *Six Papers Containing* [here follow names of Tracts]. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. Printed in the year 1687.

[Very badly *printed*, probably in England at a secret press.]

1689. *Six Papers. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. To which is added An Apology for the Church of England, etc., and An Enquiry* [*etc.*]. *By the same Author.* London. Printed in the year 1689.

[Much better printed than the former.]

(*c*) [1687?] *Fourteen Papers....*

[Not seen. Probably remainder reissued, with additions, as the following.]

(*d*) [1688?] *A Collection of Seventeen Tracts and Sermons written betwixt the years* 1675 *and* 1688. *To which is added two Tracts, by another hand, namely The History of the Powder Treason, and an Impartial Consideration of the Five Jesuits Dying Speeches, who were executed for the Popish Plot*, 1679.

[Not seen. Advertised on Sermon of Jan. 31, 1688[9] among books lately printed for Ric. Chiswell; and remainder obviously republished, with additions, as the following.]

(*e*) **1689.** *A Collection of Eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State during the Reign of King James the Second* (*Seventeen whereof written in Holland and first printed there*). By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. Licensed and entered according to Order. Reprinted at London for... Starkey and...Chiswell, 1689.

[Within the cover comes this notice: "There have been so many Papers given "out for mine, which are not, that in order to the preventing of mistakes of that "kind, I have given directions for the publishing of this Collection, which contains "none but those that were writ by me in single sheets, and are now put together by "my order. G. Burnet." 4to.

This collection reissued entire in *g* and *i*, below.]

(*f*) **1689.** *Dr Burnet's Tracts. In Two Volumes.*

[Vol. I. Travels; Animadversions on Reflections upon Travels; Three Letters (on Italy). Vol. II. Translation of Lactantius; Answers to Varillas. London... J. Robinson...and A. Churchill...1689.]

(*g*) *A second Collection of Several Tracts and Discourses written in the years* 1686...[*to*]...1689. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. (consecrated Bishop of Sarum, Easter-Day, 1689). London...Chiswell...1689. 4to.

[A continuation of (*a*). Like it, apparently, made up of "remainders" and its "remainder" reissued as vol. II. of the 1704 Collection in three vols. q.v. *infra* (i).]

(*h*) **1703.** *A third Collection of Several Tracts and Discourses written in the years* 1690, *to* 1703. By Dr Gilbert Burnet,...Bishop of Sarum. London...Chiswell...1703.

[See last item. Remainder reissued as vol. III. of next item.]

(*i*) **1704.** *A Collection of Several Tracts and Discourses written in the years* 1677, *to* 1704. By Gilbert Burnet, D.D. Now...Bishop of Sarum. In three volumes. London...Chiswell...1704.

[I.e. the "remainders" of the three former Collections reissued with a new general title-page, and new tables of contents. In vol. II. the *Vindication of the Ordinations* appears in its second edition, dated 1688.]

(*j*) **1713.** *A Collection of Speeches, Prefaces, Letters, etc. With a Description of Geneva and Holland.* By Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum. To which is added, his Citation...Answer...and three Letters writ by him upon that subject to the Earl of Middletoune. London...1713. Price 1*s.* 6*d.* [No publisher's name.]

[This is a mere hack-farrago. It has no Pref. and whether conceived in a hostile or friendly spirit cannot be said, though we incline to believe it is friendly. It contains Accounts of Geneva and Holland [from the Letters]; Extract on Revision of Liturgy from Visitation Charge, 1704; Character of Tillotson from Sermon; Declaration of Upper House of Convocation, in favour of his XXXIX Articles; Pretended grounds of complaint by Chancellor Woodward, and Answer of the Upper House. The remaining items are in chronological list, *supra*.]

A FEW WORKS ERRONEOUSLY ASCRIBED TO BURNET IN CATALOGUES[1].

1674. *The Court Sermon*, 1674. *Supposed to have been written by Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury.* Cincinnati...1868.

[See *N. and Q.*, 3rd series, XII. 367. It is certainly not by Burnet, since the preacher describes himself as "bred" at *Oxford*.]

1683. *Dr Burnet's Letter to his Friend in London. Being an Answer to a late scurrilous Pamphlet entitled his Farewell.* London. Printed by G. C. for A. Gad, 1683.

[This is probably a mere pamphleteer's retort; though it may be founded on Burnet's conversation or a letter from him. See *Hist.* ed. Airy, II. 386 [fol. pag.], I. 562.]

[1] This list does not claim to be exhaustive.

1679–81. *The History of the Gunpowder-Treason, collected from approved Authors....*London...Chiswell...1679. [Anon.]

*A Vindication of the History of the Gunpowder-Treason...*1681. [Anon.]

*An Impartial Consideration of those Speeches which pass under the name of the Five Jesuits lately executed...*1679. [Anon.]

[Not by Burnet. In the title-page of the 1689 edition of the *Six Papers* (with additions) they are ascribed to "another hand." The publisher's advertisement on Burnet's Sermon of Dec. 22, 1680, ascribes these tracts to "Mr Williams."]

1685. *The Protestant's Companion, or, an Impartial Survey and Comparison of the Protestant Religion as by Law established, with the main Doctrines of Popery....*London...Chiswell...1685. [Anon.]

[Ascribed in some Catalogues to Burnet, but not in Flexman's list. Not I think by him; he had no time to write such a work in England under James II, and the style is unlike his.]

1688. *Reflections upon Mr Varillas his History of Heresy...as far as relates to... Wicliff.* n.p. 1688. [Anon.]

[Pocock (ed. *Hist. Reform.*) and the Bodleian ascribe this to Burnet, erroneously. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 36707, f. 20 attributes it, upon "knowledge," to "K. and H."]

1688. *The ill effects of Animosities among Protestants in England detected ...*1688. [Anon.]

[Attributed to Burnet in *Brit. Mus. Cat.* Not in his style; and does not occur in *Eighteen Papers.*]

1688. *The Expedition of his Highness the Prince of Orange for England. Giving an Account of the most remarkable Passages thereof, from the day of his setting sail from Holland to the first day of this instant December,* 1688. *In a Letter to a person of quality.* [s. sh. 4to.] Printed in the year 1688. [Anon.]

[Dated Wincanton, 1 Dec. 1688, and signed N. N. No doubt it is intended to be ascribed to Burnet, but neither this, nor the catchpenny letter from Exeter, Nov. 24, printed with it, is in the least after the style of Burnet, who is more than once mentioned.]

1689. *A Representation of the threatening Dangers impending over Protestants in Great Britain...*1689. [Anon.]

[By Robert Ferguson. See his *Life.*]

1689. *A Letter out of the Country to a Member of Parliament concerning the Bishops under suspension...*1689. [Anon.]

[Ascribed to Burnet by an anonymous answerer, and by Grascombe, but claimed by anonymous author in the tract *Falsehood detected*, licensed Feb. 29, 1690. See Arber's *Term Cat.*, II. 314.]

1697. Several anonymous answers to King James II's *Memorials* have been attributed to Burnet. For the most probable ascription see *supra*, chronological list.

1702. *An Elegy on the death of that Illustrious Monarch William the Third*...written by the Reverend Dr Burnet...1702.

[A common Broadsheet. The name is probably merely used as an attraction, since the doggerel is too poor even for Burnet. Moreover an authorized production would have styled him Bishop of Sarum.]

1702. *The present state of Jacobitism in England. A second part. In answer to the first.* London, 1702. 4to. [Anon.]

[Could not be seen, as Brit. Mus. copy missing, Aug. 4, 1905. The Catalogue ascribes it to Burnet, but the identification is not likely to be correct, as the tract does not appear in the *Third Collection*.]

[1703.] *A Memorial offered to...the Princess Sophia*...[signed G. S. and dated May 15, O.S. 1703]...By Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury... London, 1815.

[Pub. from the Hanoverian Archives. A sentence in the book identifies the author with G(eorge) S(mythe) of North Nibley.]

1707. *Dr Burnet's Sermon of the unpardonable Sin against the Holy Ghost...Licensed according to Order.* London...sold for the benefit of the poor. 1707.

[A roughly printed pamphlet. Can hardly be Burnet's, as he is not called Bishop of Sarum. Possibly it is taken from notes of a sermon by Dr Burnet of the Charterhouse.]

[1716?] *The Pious Instructor or, the Heavenly Warning Piece. Being a Token for Youth...written by Dr B——t late L[or]d Bishop of S——y and found in his Closet after his Disease. Licensed and entered according to Order.*

[A poor little tract; probably assigned to him for "catchpenny" reasons.]

1717. *The Life of...John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury...from the Minutes of...Mr Young, late Dean of Salisbury.* By F. H., M.A. With many curious Memoirs communicated by the late...Gilbert...Bishop of Sarum...London...Curll...1717.

[A piece of flagrant hack-work. The "particulars" supplied by Burnet are from his funeral sermon on Tillotson. (See Kennett, III. 673; and Birch, *Life* of Tillotson, who points out the suspicious circumstance that this *Life* was published by Curll.)]

1717. *A Summary of all the Religious Houses in England and Wales*... London...1717. [Anon.]

[Ascribed elsewhere to G. Duckett (*Brit. Mus. Cat.* sub England). A more probable ascription. If Burnet's, his name would have appeared.]

N.B. Works by Thomas Burnet of the Charterhouse, and Gilbert Burnet, son of the Bishop, are sometimes inadvertently catalogued under the heading Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury.

APPENDIX III.

LIST OF LETTERS FROM GILBERT BURNET KNOWN TO BE EXTANT.

1666. To Dr Wishart, Bishop of Edinburgh. Saltoun. March 5. *Trans. Soc. Antiq. Scotland*, 1812, pp. 353–5; and *supra*, pp. 67–8.

[1671[1]?] To Sir James Turner, Glas[gow]. May 1. Turner's *Memoirs*, p. 248.

[Concerning certain books and papers.]

[1671[1]?] To the same. Hamilton. Nov. 22. *Ibid.* p. 252.

[Turner's affairs; relations of Lauderdale and Hamilton; Burnet has refused a Bishopric.]

[1673?] To the same. Hamilton. Aug. 18. *Ibid.* p. 248.

[On material for the Hamilton Memoirs.]

1673. To the same. Hamil[ton]. Aug. 22. *Ibid.* p. 250.

[Same subject.]

1673. To the Duke of Lauderdale. Dec. 15. Wodrow, *Hist.* ed. Edinburgh, 1721–2, vol. I., App. p. 149; and *supra*, pp. 119–21, which has been collated with a more correct copy among the Lauderdale MSS., Ham House.

1674. To the Rector of Glasgow University. London. Sept. 10. *Munimenta Almæ Universitatis Glasguenis*, II. 343; and *supra*, p. 126.

1674. To Secretary Coventry [Nov. 29]. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 32095, f. 203. See *supra*, p. 133 n.

[1679?] To William Fulman [October?]. *Hist. Reform.*, Pocock's ed., VII. 26–7. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

1679–80. To the King. Jan. 29. *Life* appended to *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 686 et sqq.; Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, ff. 5–6. See *supra*, pp. 159–61.

1679[80]. To the Earl of Halifax. Feb. 16. Roy. Hist. Soc. *Cam.* [3rd Ser.] *Misc.* XI. pp. 3–4.

Newsletter; see *supra*, pp. 163–5.

1679–80. To James Fall. Feb. 17. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 7. See *supra*, p. 163.

[1] 1673, the date suggested in the printed version, is evidently incorrect.

[1679–80.] To the Earl of Halifax. [Feb. 27.] Roy. Hist. Soc. *Cam.* [3rd ser.] *Misc.* XI. pp. 5–7.
Newsletter; see *supra*, pp. 163–5.

[1679–80.] To the same. March 6. *Ibid.* pp. 7–8.
Newsletter; see *supra*, pp. 163–5.

1679–80. To the same. March 13. *Ibid.* pp. 8–10.
Newsletter; see *supra*, pp. 163–5.

1679–80. To William Fulman. March 19. *Hist. Reform.*, Pocock's ed., VII. 29. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

1679–80. To the Earl of Halifax. March 20. Roy. Hist. Soc. *Cam.* [3rd Ser.] *Misc.* XI. pp. 10–11.
Newsletter; see *supra*, pp. 163–5.

1680. To the same. March 27. *Ibid.* pp. 11–13.
1680. To the same. April 3. *Ibid.* pp. 14–15.
1680. To the same. April 10. *Ibid.* pp. 16–18.
1680. To the same. April 17. *Ibid.* pp. 18–19.
[1680.] To the same. [April 24?] *Ibid.* p. 20.
1680. To the same. May 2. *Ibid.* pp. 21–2.
1680. To the same. May 8. *Ibid.* pp. 22–3.
1680. To the same. May 15. *Ibid.* pp. 23–6.
1680. To the same. May 29. *Ibid.* pp. 26–7.
1680. To the same. June 5. *Ibid.* pp. 27–9.
1680. To the same. June 12. *Ibid.* pp. 29–32.
1680. To the same. June 19. *Ibid.* pp. 32–3.
1680. To the same. June 26. *Ibid.* pp. 33–4.
1680. To the same. July 3. *Ibid.* p. 35.
1680. To the same. July 10. *Ibid.* pp. 35–6.
1680. To the same. July 17. *Ibid.* pp. 36–7.
1680. To the same. July 29. *Ibid.* pp. 37–8.

Newsletters; see *supra* pp. 163–5.

[1680.] To William Fulman. July 29. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 34. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

1680. To the Earl of Halifax. July 30. Roy. Hist. Soc. *Cam.* [3rd Ser.] *Misc.* XI. pp. 38–40.
Newsletter; see *supra*, pp. 165–7.

1680. To the same. Aug. 7. *Ibid.*
See last entry.

[1680.] To William Fulman. Sept. 7. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 36–7. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

[1680.] To Dr [Edmund] Borlace. Sept. 23. Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane 1008, f. 283.

[On the *Life* of Rochester.]

[1680?] To William Fulman. [Oct.?] *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 38. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

[1680.] To the same. Oct. 19. *Ibid.* p. 39. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

[1680.] To Dr [Edmund] Borlace. Nov. 10. Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane 1008, f. 287.

[On a work of Borlace's.]

[1680.] To William Fulman. Dec. 12. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 40. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

1680. To Dr [Edmund] Borlace. Dec. 30. Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane 1008, f. 291.

[On *Life* of Rochester, and second vol. *Hist. Reform.*]

1680–81. To William Fulman. Jan. 1. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 40–1. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

1680–81. To the same. Jan. 12. *Ibid.* p. 42. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

1680–81. To the same. Feb. 22. *Ibid.* p. 43. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

[1680–81.] To Dr [Edmund] Borlace. Feb. 26. Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane 1008, f. 295.

[Sending second vol. *Hist. Reform.*]

[1680–81.] To William Fulman. Feb. 29. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 44. See *supra*, p. 163 and n.

[1680–81.] To Dr [Edmund] Borlace. March 9. Brit. Mus. MSS. Sloane 1008, f. 299.

[With character of Mr Timothy Hill.]

[1681.] To William Fulman. June 18. *Hist. Reform.*, ed. Pocock, VII. 45–6. See *supra* p. 163 and n.

[1681.] Circular Letter on the Scottish Test., Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 101–2. See *supra*, pp. 173–6.

[1681? 1682?] To Mrs Wharton. July 14. Malcolm's *Granger's Letters* [1805], pp. 220–224. [*Gent. Mag.* 1815, I. 493–5.] See *supra*, p. 179.

1682. To the same. Sept. 7. *Ibid.* pp. 224–5. [*Ibid.* p. 587.]

[Thanks her for the Earl of Rochester's picture.]

[1682.] To the same. Nov. 8. *Ibid.* pp. 246 (from beginning of 2nd paragraph) to 252. [*Ibid.* II. 497–499, 543.] See *supra*, pp. 180, 181.

1682. To the same. Dec. 5. Malcolm's *Granger*, pp. 225–7. See *supra*, pp. 177–8.

1682. To the same. Dec. 8. *Ibid.* pp. 227–9. See *supra*, p. 180.

[1682.] To the same. [Dec. 11.] *Ibid.* pp. 229–32.

[On her resentment for his believing report mentioned in preceding letter; has seen Mr Wharton; recommends large doses of tea "often five or six cups at a time" for headaches.]

1682. To the same. Dec. 12. *Ibid.* pp. 232–33.

[Praises the *Essay on Poetry*; criticizes Dryden's *Religion of a Layman*; is corresponding with Waller about Mrs Wharton's poetry.]

1682. To the same. Dec. 19. *Ibid.* pp. 233–5.

[On her health, and poetry; censures Mrs Afra Behn; etc., etc.]

1682. To the same. Dec. 20. *Ibid.* pp. 236–8. See *supra*, pp. 180–1.

[1682–83.] To the same. Jan. 2. *Ibid.* pp. 238–41. [*Gent. Mag.* 1815, I. 306–8.] See *supra*, pp. 178, 180.

[1682–83?] To the same. [Jan.?] *Ibid.* pp. 242 to 246 (end of 1st paragraph). [*Ibid.* pp. 396–8.] See *supra*, pp. 178, 179–180.

1682–83. To the Animadverter [Dr Comber]. Jan. 22. Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. b. 2, f. 69. See *supra*, p. 182.

[1682–83.] To James Fall. Feb. 15. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 3. See *supra*, pp. 179, 181, 184–5, 185–6.

1682–83. To Sir Edward Harley. Feb. 15. Hist. MSS. Comm. Rep. 1904, Longleat MSS. vol. I, pp. 44–5. See *supra*, p. 185, l. 14 note.

1682–83. To the Animadverter [Dr Comber]. March 14. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 99. See *supra*, pp. 182–4.

1683. To Sir Edward Harley. May 26. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. 1904, Longleat MSS. vol. I, pp. 45–6. See *supra*, p. 176.

1683. To the same. June 5. *Ibid.* p. 46. See *supra*, p. 176.

1683. To Mr Brisbane. July 17 [15]. Napier's *Montrose and the Covenanters*, I. 14–18; *Memorials...of Dundee*, I. 46–9; and *supra*, pp. 191–3.

[1683.] To Sir Edward Harley. July 19. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. 1904, Longleat MSS., vol. I. 46–7. See *supra*, p. 194.

[1683.] To Lady Russell. [Presumably July 20.] Russell's *Life* of Russell, 3rd ed. vol. II, 95–6.

[Advising her to send to the king a copy of her husband's "letter."]

[1683.] To the Bishop of London [Compton]. July 30. Bodl. MSS. Rawlinson, C. 983, f. 61. See *supra*, p. 197.

[1683.] To Sir Edward Harley. Nov. 20. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. 1904, Longleat MSS. vol. I, p. 47. See *supra*, p. 202.

1683. To the same. Dec. 8, 1683. *Ibid.* p. 48.

[On *Life* of Bedell.]

[1684.] To the same. Jan. 22. *Ibid.* See *supra*, p. 202.

1683[4]. To Lady Russell. Feb. 2. *Letters*, 7th ed. Sellwood, 1809. p. 16–9.

[Consolation on the death of her husband.]

[1684.] To Sir Edward Harley. April 3. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. 1904, Longleat MSS. vol. I, p. 48. See *supra*, p. 202–3.

1684[–5]. To the same. Jan. 10. *Ibid.* p. 49. See *supra*, p. 205.

[1684–85.] To the same. Feb. 12. *Ibid.* p. 50. See *supra*, p. 206.

[*The published Letters to Boyle*, 1685–6 *are placed in the Bibliography.*]

[1686.] To M. Le Clerc. At the Hague the 24th July. Library of the Remonstrants, Amsterdam, J. 13, e.—No 5 R. K. A copy is in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, p. 225.

[1686.] To Mr Fall. Hague, Sept. 26. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23. f. 1; and *supra*, pp. 219–221.

[1686.] To M. Le Clerc. Hagæ Comitis, 8 Octobris, meridie. Library of the Remonstrants, Amsterdam. J. 13. c.—No. 3 R. K. Copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, p. 225.

[1686.] To the same. A la Haye ce 31 Octobre. As above, J. 13. a.—No. 1 R. K. Copy as above; see *supra*, p. 225.

[1686.] To the same. A la Haye ce 7^{me} Decembre. As above, J. 13. d.—No. 4 R. K. Copy as above; see *supra*, p. 225.

[1687.] To the same. A la Haie (*sic*) ce 13^{me} de May (*sic*) [1687]. As above, J. 13. b.—No. 2 R. K. Copy as above; see *supra*, p. 225.

1687. To M. Papin. A la Haye le troisième Septembre 1687. An extract will be found in Bossuet's *Sixième Avertissement sur les Lettres de M Jurieu* [1691] (*Œuvres Complètes*, ed. 1840–1, XI. 450); and longer extracts in Papin's *La Tolérance des Protestants*[1] [1692], pp. 398–400, 410–11; see *supra*, p. 325.

[On the impending visit of Papin to Brandenburg; Burnet recommends him to the Schombergs, takes his part in the controversy with Jurieu, and gives his general approval to Papin's treatise (*La Foi reduite a ses justes bornes*) but with some qualification.]

1687. To the same. Du huitième Septembre. Extracts are given by Papin, *La Tolérance*, p. 400.

[See preceding letters (first two topics).]

[1687.] To Philip van Limborch. Hagæ Comitis Pridie Calendas Novembris [Oct. 31]. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. j.—R. K. A copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23; see *supra*, p. 226.

[1] A copy of this rare and interesting little treatise is in Dr Williams' Library, Gordon Square, London W.C. Papin, a Huguenot refugee who had received Anglican orders in 1686, became on Jan. 15, 1690, a member of the Roman Church, in reaction from the extreme Latitudinarianism which he had deduced from the dogma of Private Judgement. See the work in question (especially pp. 395–472); *Biog. Universelle*, vol. XXXII., p. 97; and Bossuet, *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. 1840–1, pp. 448–50. Papin quotes Burnet's letters as proofs of the latter's former confidence in him, and Latitudinarian tolerance.

1688. To the same. Hagæ Comitis, 16to Januarii. *Ibid.* M. 19. a.—No. 1 R. K. Copy as above; see *supra*, pp. 226, 228.

1688. To the same. 12mo Febr. *Ibid.* M. 19. b.—No. 2 R. K. Copy as above; see *supra*, pp. 227–8.

1688. To M. Papin. April 6. Extracts are given in Papin's *La Tolérance*, pp. 439–40.

[On Papin's controversy with Jurieu concerning grace, and scheme of returning to England.]

1688. To a lady. April 14. Extracts are given in Papin's *La Tolérance*, pp. 440–1.

[On the controversy between Papin and Jurieu, and the intolerance of the latter; "nous avons des Papes de nôtre côté, qui seraient aussi grands persecuteurs que ceux de "l'Eglise Romaine s'ils avoient autant de pouvoir."]

1688. To M. Papin. April 27. An extract will be found in Bossuet's *Sixième Avertissement sur les Lettres de M. Jurieu* [1691], (*Œuvres Complètes*, 1840–1, XI. 450); and longer extracts in Papin's *La Tolérance*, pp. 414, 462.

[Discusses the *Dissertatio...de Pace Ecclesiastica* of Strimesius; advises Papin against attending the Synod of Bois-le-duc.]

1688. To the same. De la Haye, le 30 May, 1688. Papin's *La Tolérance*, pp. 437, 450–1.

[On the Jurieu controversy; the death of the Elector of Brandenburg, with its effect on Papin's prospects; the impending synod, and its bearing on Papin's pamphlet.]

1688. To the same. À la Haye, le dix septième Juin. *Ibid.* pp. 463–4.

[Advising Papin, in consequence of Jurieu's hostility, to settle at Dantzic.]

1688. To a Translator. À la Haye. Sept. 18. Bodl. MSS. Rawlinson Letters, 107, f. 106.

[On a recommendation Burnet has promised him, *re* work of Burnet's he is doing.]

[1688?.] To the same. "Le Lundy" [Sept. ?]. *Ibid.* f. 108.

[Same subject.]

[1688.] To Admiral Herbert. [About Oct. $\frac{21}{31}$.] Tuesday morning. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 528–9. See *supra*, p. 251.

[1688.] To [? Cypher letter]. Tor Bay. Nov. $\frac{5}{15}$. Bodl. Rawlinson MSS. A. 186, f. 101.

[Extract only. Destination unknown. Said to concern conduct of English fleet.]

[1688.] To Admiral Herbert. Friday, Nov. 16. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 530–1. See *supra*, pp. 252–3.

[1688.] To the same. Thursday the 29th November. *Ibid.* pp. 531–2. See *supra*, pp. 253, 254.

[1688.] To his wife [?]. Nov. 29 [1688]. *N. and Q.*, Ser. II., vol. II., p. 244. See *supra*, pp. 252, 253 and notes.

[1688.] To Admiral Herbert. Dec. 9. *Supp. Hist. Own Time*, pp. 532–5.

[Newsletter.]

[1688.] To the same. Christmas Day. *Ibid.* pp. 535–6. See *supra*, pp. 259–60.

[1689.] To Lady Russell. [July 13.] *Letters*, ed. 1809. pp. 225–8.

[A civil message from his wife; thanks for her care of his books; news.]

1689. To Philip van Limborch. Londini, 24 Julii. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. c.—R. K. A copy is in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, pp. 275–6 and note.

1689. [To Lord Shrewsbury's Secretary.] Sept. 7. *Cal. State Papers Domestic*, W. and M., I. 245–6. See *supra*, p. 270.

[1689.] To the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Dr Ken). Sarum. Oct. 1st. Plumptre's *Ken*, 2nd ed. II. 46. See *supra*, p. 302.

[1689–90.] To Sir William Dutton Colt. Feb. 22. Ralph, *Hist.* II. 1000; *Hist. Own Time* [fol. pag.], II. 295, note. See *supra*, pp. 283–4.

1690. To Secretary Southwell. Sept. 20. Hist. MSS. Com. III. 420 [MSS. of John Webster of Aberdeen].

[As to filling up the vacancies in the Irish Church.]

[1690?.] To the third Duke of Hamilton. [Date not given.] Abstracted in Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. I., App. p. 113 (Hamilton MSS.). See *supra*, p. 305.

1690. To Mr James Johnston. Oct. $\frac{14}{24}$. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 34095, f. 160. See *supra*, pp. 300–1 and note; 305–6.

1691. To Attorney General Treby. April 6. Hist. MSS. Com. XIII. App. VI. p. 29. See *supra*, pp. 303–4.

[1693.] To the Rev. Richard Davies. [After April 22, 1693.] Bodl. Add. MSS. D. 23, ff. 16–25. See *supra*, p. 204 n.

[On Fulman's animadversions upon *Life* of Bedel.]

1693. To Philip van Limborch. Feb. 12. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. d.—R. K. 2; a copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, pp. 314–15.

1693. To the same. Westminster, 10mo Novembris S.V. *Ibid.* M. 19. e.—R. K. 3; copy as above. See *supra*, p. 315.

1694. To Mr Fatio (at Southampton House). June 29. Hist. MSS. Com. Rep. X., App. VI. 257.

[On the affairs of Lady Russell and her son.]

1694. To Philip van Limborch. Westminster. 18 Novembris. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. f.—R. K. A copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, p. 326.

1695. To the Electress Sophia. September 26. Royal Library, Hanover, Leibnitz MSS., Burnet Bundle, Nos. 3–4; and *supra*, pp. 336–8.

1696. To the Electress Sophia. April 7. Kemble, *State Papers*, pp. 184–6. See *supra*, p. 339.

1696. To Lady Russell. Salisbury, 31 Oct. *Letters*, 7th ed. Sellwood, 1809, pp. 323–5.

[On the birth of her grandchild John, afterwards 3rd Duke of Rutland.]

1696. To the Electress Sophia. Dec. 15. *Memorial...to the Princess Sophia*, pp. 97–9; Kemble, p. 187.

[Newsletter.]

[**1696–97.**] To Dr Colbatch. London, 16 March. Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 22908, f. 25^b. See *supra*, p. 333.

1698. To Dr Fall. March 19, 1698. Bodl. MSS. Add. 23, f. 10. See *supra*, pp. 348–9.

1698. To the same. April 5. *Ibid.* f. 12. See *supra*, pp. 349–50.

[**1698.**] To Philip van Limborch. Londini, 27th Maii. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. i.—R. K. A copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, pp. 346–7.

[**1698.**] Circular letter to her relations, on death of his second wife. [June?.] Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, ff. 77–8. See *supra*, p. 352.

1698. To Dr Finch [Warden of All Souls]. Oct. 15. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 64. See *supra*, p. 294.

[**1698** or **1699**?.] To M. Le Clerc. [Date unknown.] Fox Bourne's *Locke*, II. 416, 437 (imperfect). See *supra*, p. 359.

[**1698.**] To Philip van Limborch. [Jan. ?.] Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. k.—R.K. Copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, pp. 347–8, 354–5.

1699. To the Electress Sophia. Feb. 16. O.S. Kemble's *State Papers*, pp. 233–4.

[Recommending Mr Hackman; mentions Leibnitz "whom we doe all here reckon one of the greatest men that has lived in any age."]

1699. To Leibnitz. Feb. 17 O.S. Hanover Royal Library, Leibn. MSS. I, vol. XII. N. 4, Bl. 4; and *supra*, pp. 363–4.

1699. To Dr Fall. Windsor Castle, 25 July. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 26; and *supra*, pp. 368–70.

[**1699**]–**1700.** To the Electress Sophia. Feb. 27 O.S. *Memorial... to the Princess Sophia*, p. 100 and Klopp, *Corres. de Leib. avec L'Électrice*...II. 146. See *supra*, pp. 370–1.

1699–1700. To Dr Colbatch. March 21st. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 22908, f. 33. See *supra*, pp. 427–8.

1700. To Archbishop Tenison. May 25. Lambeth MSS. 942 (159), (Copy in Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 4292, ff. 34–5); and *supra*, p. 375.

1700. To Sir Thomas Burnet of Leys [3rd Bart.]. Bradford, 1 June. *The family of Burnett of Leys*, p. 75.

[On his brother's death (in a duel?).]

[1700–1.] To Philip van Limborch. 4^mo^ Diæ Martii, S.V. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam, M. 19. g.—R. K. 5. Copy in Bodl. MSS. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, p. 388.

1701. To Leibnitz. Salisbury, 30 June. *Memorial...to the Princess Sophia*, p. 103; Kemble, *State Papers*, p. 248. See *supra*, p. 389.

1701–2. To Dr Colbatch. St. James's, 1 Jan. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 22908, ff. 43–4. See *supra*, p. 428.

1702. To Leibnitz. Salisbury, 2 Aug. Hanover Royal Library [Leibnitz MSS. I, vol. XII. No. 4, Blatt 5]. See *supra*, pp. 395–6.

1702. To Archbishop Tenison. Saturday, Aug. 15, 1702. Lambeth MSS. 930 (31). See *supra*, pp. 396–7.

1703. To the Bishop of London. Salisbury, Oct. 1. Bodl. MSS. Rawlinson C. 984, f. 150.

[Concerning a case before the Courts which Burnet defers at the Bishop's wish; enquires after his health.]

[1705.] To Lord Treasurer Godolphin. Aug. 9. 4 o'clock. Bodl. MSS. D. 23, f. 9. See *supra*, pp. 418–19.

1706. To Leibnitz. London, April 10. *Memorial...to the Princess Sophia*, p. 111.

[Acknowledges notes (on *Exposition*?) and recommends Lord Halifax, the bearer.]

1706. To Archbishop Tenison. Salisbury, June 15. Lambeth MSS. 930 (12).—[Copy in Brit. Mus. MSS., Sloane 4292, f. 63.] See *supra*, pp. 422–3.

1706. To Baron Ezekiel Spanheim. Dec. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 182.

[Draught of a Latin letter of thanks for presentation copy of a treatise.]

1706. To Dean Younger. Salisbury, 12 August. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 30. See *supra*, p. 419.

1706. To Mr Chiswell. Salisbury. Aug. 21. Bodl. MSS. Rawl. Lett. 107 (f. 109).

[Desiring him to put up presentation copies of certain works for "my friends in Scotland."]

1706. To Dean Younger. Salisbury, 24 August. Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 31. See *supra*, p. 419.

[1706?.] To Lord Commissioner Trevor. September 19. Bodl. MSS. Hearne, *Diaries*, lxxiii. 39. See *supra*, p. 294, note.

1707. To Archbishop Tenison. Aug. 27. Lambeth MSS. 941 (17). Copy in Brit. Mus. Sloane MSS. 4292, f. 46. See *supra*, pp. 430, 431.

[1707?.] To Niccolo Crizzo. [September?.] Bodl. MSS. Add. D. 23, f. 177. See *supra*, p. 431.

[*The Dodwell Letters*, 1710–11, *will be found in the Bibliography, with the rest of the correspondence, under date* 1713.]

1711. To Lady Russell. May 30. *Letters*, ed. 1853, vol. II. pp. 190–2.

[On death of her son.]

17[11–]12. To Philip van Limborch. Londini, 17 Martii, S.V. Remonstrants' Library, Amsterdam. M. 19. h.—R. K. 6. Copy in Bodl. MSS. Add. Eng. th. c. 23. See *supra*, pp. 454–5.

1712–3. To Rev. Thomas Baker. Jan. 2. Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. d. 1 (83). See *supra*, p. 461.

1712–3. To the same. St John's, 5 Feb. *Ibid.* (84). See *supra*, p. 461.

1713[–14]. To the Rev. Edward Raynes. Jan. 23. Pocock's ed. *Hist. Reform.* VII. 224 (from *Brit. Mag.* VI. 382).

[*Re* materials for third vol., *Hist. Reform.*]

1713[–14]. To Mr Strype. St John's, 30 Jan. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 5853, f. 550 [copy]. See also Pocock's ed. *Hist. Reform.* VII. 8; and *supra*, p. 461.

[Same subject.]

1713–14. To the Rev. Edward Raynes. Feb. 6. Pocock, VII. 225 (from *Brit. Mag.*).

[Same subject.]

1714[15]. To Rev. Thomas Baker. London, 22 Jan. Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. d. 1 (84).

[Asking where presentation copy *Hist. Reform.*, vol. III. shall be sent, and begging for criticism.]

1714–5. To the same. London, 29 Jan. Brit. Mus. MSS. Add. 5831, f. 155; also Grey's *Review of Neal*, 1744, pp. 62–3 n. See *supra*, p. 472.

[1714–5.] To the same. London, 8 Feb. Bodl. MSS. Eng. Hist. d. 1 (84). See *supra*, pp. 472–3.

Letters of Burnet, undated, are mentioned as in collection of Robert D. Lyons of Dublin, *Hist. MSS. Com. Rep.* II. 232. The Strype and Comber letters mentioned in Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, vol. I. pp. 12 (note) and 602 are probably those included in the present list.

INDEX.

[*For notes other than footnotes refer to Appendix I* (*notes*), *pages* 485—521.]

Aberdeen, city of, 15, 16
Aberdeen, New, Marischall College of, 17, 20, 31, 34, 361, 475
Aberdeen, Synod of, 23, 24, 176
Aberdeenshire, 3–4, 6, 7, 23
Abingdon, 255
Abjuration Bills [1690 and 1691], 285, [1702], 390
"Accommodation" (Leighton's scheme of), 87–97, 90 n, 102, 105
Advocate, King's, for Scotland, 1687 (Dalrymple, Sir John, q.v.), 232
Advocates (Scottish), 122
Aird, Mr James, 92–4, 92 n, 220, 368–70
Airy, Dr Osmund, vi, 42
Alchemy, 153, 172
Allegiance, Oaths of, 261, 271–4, 472
Allestree, Richard, D.D., 39, 312
Alliance, Second Grand, The, 389–93, 423, 437–8
Allix, Peter, D.D., 293, 293 n
Almanza, battle of, 430
Alsace, 437
Ambrose, Bishop and Saint, 69
America, 186, 378, 383–6, 457, 459
Amsterdam, 48, 49, 215, 220, 267, 429
Anabaptists, 15, 48, 49, 283, 324
Andrews, Lancelot, Bishop of Winchester, 27
Angus, Adam (Burnet's amanuensis), 152, 152 ftn
Annandale, 7
Anne, Princess of Denmark, afterwards Queen, 218, 240, 246, 264, 307–8, 336, 345, 350–1, 354, 356–7, 374, 381–2, 390, 392–7, 399–401, 403, 406–10, 414–22, 419 n, 425–6, 429–33, 435, 437–8, 441–6, 448, 452, 457, 459, 461, 464–6, 469–70, 546–8
Antinomianism, 323–4
"Apostolic" Canons or Constitutions, 82, 280, 454
Arbroath, 3
Arbuthnot, Dr John, 474, 474 n
Arianism, 452, 456, 467
Argyll, Earls, Marquises, and Dukes of, see Campbell
Arlington, Earl of, see Bennet
Arminianism, 19, 48, 49, 84, 146, 183, 225–8, 312, 325–6, 364–5, 368, 398
Arnold, Dr Thomas, 299
Arnot, Sir John, Provost of Edinburgh, 7
Articles of the English Church (and see Burnet's *Exposition*, among his Works), 146, 283, 365, 368, 388
Ashley, Lord, see Cooper
Assembly, General, of the Church of Scotland, 13, 16, 376
"Assertory Act" (Supremacy Act), Scottish, 77–8, 88, 174
"Association, The," of 1688, 253, 443
Astell, Mary, 436
Athanasian Creed, 278, 278 n, 328, 366
Atheism, Atheists, 168, 179, 259, 311–2, 321, 333, 347, 474
Athelstaneford, parish of, 54
Athol, Earl and Marquis of, see Murray
Attainder, Acts of, 340–3
Atterbury, Dr Francis, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, 274, 376, 387, 390, 401, 429, 443, 447, 454, 483, 546
Attorney-General [1683] (Sir Robert Sawyer), 190
Attorney-General [1689–91] (Sir George Treby), 303–4
Auersperg, Count, 340 n
Augustine, 280, 364, 366 n, 366–7
Austin, see Augustine
Austria, 350, 389, 390, 406, 423
Ayrshott, Dr, 257–8

Bacon, Sir Francis ("Lord" Bacon), 139, 151, 202
Baillie, George (of Jerviswood, son of Robert Baillie), 410–1, 441
Baillie, Robert (of Jerviswood, father of George Baillie), 186, 189, 189 n, 235
Baillie, Robert, Principal of Glasgow University, 43
Baker, Thomas, antiquary and non-juror, 461, 472–3, 565
Balfour, Mr, 346
Banchory Ternan (barony of), 3–4
Bank of England, its foundation, 320
Bannockburn, battle of, 3
Balcarres, Earls and Countess of, see Lindsay
Baptism, Sacrament of, 274, 278–9, 408, 453

Baptismal regeneration, doctrine of, 279
Bar-le-duc (the "Pretender" at), 466
Barclay, William, Scottish Jurist, 10
Barillon, M. de, French Ambassador to Whitehall, 209–11, 236
"Barrier," the, of the United Provinces, 386, 423, 437, 441
Barrow, Dr Isaac, 312
Bartholomew, Massacre of St, 155, 526
"Bartholomew's Day," 1662, 38, 145, 302
Basel, Basle, 4, 211
Basil, St, 312
Basnage, Jaques, 325
Bates, Dr William, 400, 402
Bathurst family, anecdote preserved by, 355–6
Bavaria, electoral Prince of, 383
Baxter, Richard, 33 n, 38, 43, 397–8, 400, 402
Bayle, Pierre, 532, 535
Beach, Dr, 303–4, 304 n
Beach, Philip, 304 n
Beachy Head, disaster of, 286
Beaton, Cardinal, 3–4
Bedell, William, Bishop of Kilmore, 202–4, 531, 560, 562
Bedford, Earl and Duke of, see Russell
Bedford, Hilkiah, 472–3
Behn, Mrs Afra, 560
Belisarius, 449
Bennet, Henry, 1st Earl of Arlington, 87
Benthinck, William, afterwards 1st Earl of Portland, 217, 217 n, 222, 256, 260, 263–4, 282, 286, 286 n, 338–9, 361–2, 372, 386–7, 391
Bentley, Dr William, 293, 419
Berkeley, Mr and Mrs (and see Burnet, Elisabeth), 379
Berkeley, Bishop, 436
Berkshire (part of Sarum Diocese), 289
Berlin (see also Brandenburg), 360–1, 368
Bernard, St, 295
Berne, 211
Berri, duc de, 350
Beveridge, Dr William (afterwards Bishop of St Asaph), 282, 304, 414
"Bill of Rights," 270
Birch, Dr Peter, 258
"Bishops, the Seven," 239–40, 301–4
Blackheath, 216
Blasphemy, Bill against (1698), 346 n, 346–8
Blenheim, battle and palace of, 408–9, 412
Bohun, Edmund, see Licenser of Press, 1693
Bolingbroke, Viscount, see St John
Bolton, minister of, see Cook and Nairn; parish of, 34, 46, 54
Bolton, Duke of, see Paulet
Borghese, Prince, 181, 200, 213
Borlace, Dr Edmund, 559
Borowsky, his confession, 529
Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, 247, 325, 378, 537
Bourignon, Mme, 381, 381 n
Boyle, the Hon. Robert, 39, 39 n, 151, 211, 308–9, 349, 360, 477, 532, 542
Boyne, battle of, 286, 300
Bradbury, Thomas, Independent pastor, 456, 469–70
Braddon, Laurence (Whig fanatic), 201, 270
Bradford, Dr Samuel, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle and of Rochester, 419 n
Bramhall, John, Archbishop of Armagh, 280
Brandenburg (see also Berlin), 300, 361–2, 396 n
Brisbane, John, 179, 187–8, 191–3, 560
Bristol, Bishop of (Smallridge, George), 466
Bristowe, Mr, 397, 397 n, 401, 401 n
Brook, Anne, Lady Dowager, 541
Brownists, 48, 49
Bruce, Alexander, 2nd Earl of Kincardine, 31–2, 70, 72, 95, 101 n, 102 n, 104, 121, 131, 138, 163
Bruce, Mr, eldest son of Alexander, 2nd Earl of Kincardine, 163
Brunswick, the Courts of (and see Hanover), 360
Brussells, 429
Buckingham, Duke of, see Villiers
Bull, Dr George, afterwards Bishop of St David's, 326, 414
Burial Service, Anglican, reform of the, 279
Burke, Edmund, 442
Burnard, Alexander, founder of the Burnet family, 3
Burnet, Alexander (Bishop of Aberdeen), Archbishop of Glasgow (and Archbishop of St Andrews), 61, 71, 76–8, 85
Burnet, Alexander, of Leys [1488], 3
Burnet, Alexander, of Leys, 9th laird, 3–4
Burnet, Alexander, of Leys, grandson of the 9th laird, 4
Burnet, Alexander, of Leys, great grandson of the 9th laird, 4
Burnet, Alexander, Sir, of Leys, uncle of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 21
Burnet, "Anna Sophia," infant d. of Bishop Burnet, 380, 409
Burnet, Beatrix, born Maule, 5
Burnet, Elisabeth, born Blake (by first marriage Mrs Berkeley), 3rd wife of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 353, 379–82, 380 n, 381 n, 409, 426, 428–33, 439, 456, 548
Burnet, Elisabeth, daughter of Bishop Gilbert Burnet (Mrs West), 309, 352, 429, 474
Burnet, Gilbert, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, *His Career and Character*:—
Ancestry, 3–11: birth and childhood, 11–14: early reminiscences and first impressions of Presbyterianism, 14–6: is influenced by his father; education; reads law; studies for orders; becomes a probationer; refuses a benefice, x, 17–21: loss of his father, whose ecclesiastical and political views he inherits, 21–23:

present at a meeting of the Synod of Aberdeen, inclines to Episcopacy, 23–5: makes friends with Nairn and Charteris; genius for friendship; studies art of preaching and platonic philosophy; is imbued with doctrine of passive obedience, 25–7: fascinated by Leighton, 27–9: becomes acquainted with "great men," 31–2: friendship with women, especially Lady Balcarres; gains first insight into affairs of State, 32–3: at odds with his relations; becomes melancholy; studies mathematics, and early Christianity; is dissatisfied with conduct of Church affairs; tempted to secede to Rome and become a monk; writes to Archbishop Sharp, who interviews him, 33–5: he advocates toleration; his enthusiasm and subsequent depression, 35–6: resolutions of retirement, 36: visits England on behalf of Warriston; intercourse with Moray, Drummond, Boyle, and heads of ecclesiastical parties in London, Oxford and Cambridge, 36–9: returns to Scotland; attends Warriston on scaffold; the impression made on him, 40–1: intercourse with Lauderdale, Lady Margaret Kennedy, Scougal, Fletcher and Tweeddale, 41–5: preaches at Yester, where impressed by an anecdote concerning Thauler; preaches at Saltoun, where he meets John Cockburn and Henry Scougal, 45–8: accepts parish of Saltoun; travels; becomes Fellow of Royal Society; visits Holland; avoids Scottish exiles; goes to Amsterdam; studies Hebrew; mingles with various sects; inclined to tolerance; attracted by Arminians; studies Dutch mechanics, constitution, and charity organisation, 48–50, 48 n: fears misconstruction in Flanders; goes to Paris, meets Morus; studies French pulpit oratory; visits monasteries; plans escape of a nun, 50–1: returns to England; his vanity and garrulity; proceeds to Saltoun; preaches as probationer; receives letters of presentation; passes his trials; is "called" by the parish, 51–3: preaches his patron's funeral sermon, 53–4: is ordained and instituted, 55: work in his parish, 55–60: studies; acts as clerk to Presbytery; assists to educate the young lairds; endeavours to convert Papists; intercedes for Presbyterian incumbents, 60–1: remonstrates with Scottish bishops; their resentment; his defence, 61–8: his fit of ascetism; two illnesses, 69–70: has the confidence of Kincardine, and is employed to advocate "Indulgence," 70–2: meets Duchess Hamilton and Rector of Glasgow University; further intercourse with Lady Margaret Kennedy; studies situation in the West, and delivers himself upon it publicly and privately, 72–5: leaves Saltoun for Glasgow Professorship; subsequent relations with parish, 78–9: professorial methods, 81–3: attitude towards Popery, Calvinism, Arminianism; repute as a preacher; is accused of English accent, 83–5: his political attitude; the "Accommodation," 85–97, 92 n, 94 n: visits Hamilton; undertakes Hamilton Memoirs; enthusiasm for Charles I, 97–100, 557: visits London; relations with Moray, Lauderdale, and Lady Dysart; discusses the "Accommodation"; writes on the proposed Royal divorce; refuses preferment; visits Hamilton, 100–5, 103 n, 557: corresponds with Lady Dysart, 106: reconciles Lauderdale and Hamilton; dedicates a treatise to Lauderdale, 106–12, 109 n, 112 n: is privately married, 112–3: returns to London; remonstrates with Lauderdale; meets Charles II, Ellis Leighton, Buckingham, and York; writes against Popery; excites Lauderdale's suspicions, 114–7: returns to Scotland; breach with Lauderdale; retires to Glasgow; attitude on the Synod question, 117–24: returns to London; is disgraced; resigns professorship, 125–6: settles in England; popularity as a preacher; is disappointed of preferment and forbidden Court, 130–3: traduces Lauderdale; recalls dedication; is charged with Scottish accent, 133–4: preaches loyalty, and writes against Rome, 134–6: is forced to incriminate Lauderdale; is patronized by Opposition; obtains preachership at Rolls Chapel, 136–9: his marriage discovered; his wife joins him; their relations, 139–40: becomes lecturer at St Clement's Danes; his fame and characteristics as a preacher; his literary labours; influence of Lloyd, Tillotson, and Stillingfleet, 141–4: settles in Lincoln's Inn Fields; relations with Littleton, and "Country" party; attitude towards Non-resistance, Ecclesiastical Comprehension and Popery, 144–7: relations with Chiswell, and with the Scougals, 148–9: issues Hamilton Memoirs, and starts History Reformation, 150–3: attitude towards Popish Plot, 153–5, 155 n: clandestine intercourse with Charles II, 155–7, 157 n: issues first Reformation volume, and begins second, 157: relations with Halifax, 157–8: intercourse with Mrs Roberts and letter to the King, 158–61, 159 n: correspondence and literary labours; relations with Rochester; fails of preferment; preaches to Corporation; becomes D.D., 161–7: influenced by Russell and Essex; advocates Exclusion; tries to convert Halifax, 167–8:

parliamentary popularity; sermon on Toleration; intercourse with Stafford, 168–9, 169 n: favours Regency expedient, 169–70: shares odium of Exclusionists; declines preferment; has abortive interview with King, 170–2, 171 n: retires into private life; his pursuits, 172–3: attitude towards Scottish Test, and Test "Non-jurors"; intervenes for Argyll; makes advances to Lauderdale, 173–6: becomes prudent; removes house; builds a laboratory, 177: his attitude towards the court; is called a Trimmer, 177–9: his correspondence with Mrs Wharton; poetical effusions and criticism; platonic passion; desire for death; receives distinguished visitors, 177–81, 560: his literary labours; praises Louis XIV, but defends Huguenots, 181–5: pleads for lenity to dissenters; is reassured as to "Whig" intrigue; begins his Memoirs, 185–8: his attitude towards "Protestant Plot"; gives evidence at Russell's trial; describes his own inadvertence; is shocked at suicide of Essex; his "grovelling" letter to Brisbane, 188–93: his intercourse with Russell; fails to shake his advocacy of "Resistance"; attends him on scaffold, 193–6: is examined before Council and disgraced; his retort on King's threats; receives honorarium from the Russells; is patronized by Halifax; defends himself to Bishop of London; opposes promotion of Hickes; his attitude towards the doctrine of non-resistance; writes character of Charles II, 196–8: is attacked by "Tory" press; retires to France; well received; speaks French ill, 198–200: returns to England; his character (public and private) aspersed; is present at Sydney's trial; asserts the suicide of Essex, 200–1, 200 n: goes into retirement; literary undertakings; last intercourse with Leighton; contest with Licenser of Press, 201–4, 204 n: is dismissed from Rolls; assists Scottish Test Non-jurors; retains favour of Halifax, 204–6: sentiments on demise of crown; refused audience of James II; obtains leave for self-expatriation; is detained by wife's illness; intercourse with Halifax and Whig extremists, 206–9: stay in Paris; loses his wife, 209–10: his travels and their effects, 210–5: settles at the Hague; intercourse with William and Mary; refuses overtures from England; retires from court, 215–22: his courtship of Mary Scott; relations with Le Clerc, Van Limborch, Locke, the Whig exiles, Halewyn, 222–9: his pamphleteering energy; is satirized by Dryden; modification of his views; is prosecuted in Scotland and naturalized in Holland; marries Mary Scott, 229–33: his continued persecution, 233–7, 235 n: birth of a son; political tracts; change of political view; extent of political initiation, 237–43, 241 n: his literary services and message to Princess Sophia, 243–6: becomes Prince's Chaplain; prepares to join expedition; has a final interview with Princess Mary, 246–50: experience during the Invasion and Revolution, 250–7, 562: advice to the Prince; change of opinion as to Regency solution; intervenes on behalf of Princess; remonstrates with her, x, 257–64, 264 n: becomes Bishop of Salisbury; is disliked by William, appreciated by Mary, 265–6, and nn: is consecrated; preaches Coronation sermon; anecdote concerning him, 267–8, 268 n: his first steps in House of Lords, and first Pastoral letter, 268–75: work on the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1689, 276–81, 278 n, 281 n: his relation to Scotch affairs, 281–2: action in Convocation and Parliament, 282–5, 282 n: intercourse with William and Mary, 1690, 286: his episcopal labours, 287–95, 294 n, 295 n, 298 n: daily life; his tea-drinking and smoking, 296–7, 296 n, 560: impediments to his usefulness; is accused of Highland superstition, and love of the occult, 297–8, 298 n: relations to Protestant dissenters, 298–300: attempts to cross-question William III; is appointed on an Irish Ecclesiastical Commission, 300–1, 301 n: attitude towards English Non-jurors, the ecclesiastical policy of William, and Scotch Presbyterianism, 301–6, 305 n: sources of his Scotch information, 306: original comments on Marlborough's disgrace, 307–8: excepted from pardon by James II, 308: professional works, 308–14, 320–5, 364–8: unpopular with "rigid" churchmen, 314: burning of the Pastoral letter, 317–8, 317 n: political attitude and relations, 318–20: resents aspersions on his orthodoxy, 325: is attacked by Leslie; resents conduct of Sancroft; forwards projects of Church Reform; preaches Tillotson's funeral sermon, 327–9: attends Queen Mary on her deathbed, 330–1: becomes an Ecclesiastical Commissioner, 332–3: his political influence diminished, 333: loses old friends; engages in controversy with Hickes and others, 333–5: relations with Princess Sophia and Johnston, 335–9, 338–9 nn: his attitude on the Fenwick affair, 339–43, 340–1 nn: his comments on the Peace of Ryswick and proposed commemoration, 344–5, 345 n: Session of 1697–8, 345–8: intercourse with Peter

the Great, 348–9: the affair of the Preceptorship and death of his second wife, 350–4, 351 n: previous loss of a son, 352 n: relations with his pupil, Princess Anne, her household, the Churchills, 355–8: the Watson case, 358–9: correspondence with Leibnitz concerning the irenical project, 359–64: with Fall concerning Aird and Charteris, 368–70: his anti-Roman virulence, 370–2: action in the Irish forfeiture debates, 372–3: is attacked in Parliament, 373–4: his attitude towards the Ecclesiastical Commission, Atterbury's Convocation treatise, the religious movements of the day, 374–8: the Tofts scandal; his third marriage, 378–80, 380 n: the Preceptorship determines, 382: he is attacked in Convocation, 388: comments on death of James II, 390: is present at deathbed of William III, 390–1, 391 nn: informs Anne of her accession; preaches first sermon before her, 392–3: correspondence of 1702, 395–7: interviews with Calamy; action concerning Occasional Conformity Bill, and Prince of Denmark's Bill; loses his lodgings at St James, and defends his attitude towards Calamy, 397–402: admires Clarendon's History and recasts his Memoirs, 402–5: opposes the second Conformity Bill and is attacked by Leslie, 406–7: Queen Anne ascribes to him her "Bounty," 408: his enthusiasm over battle of Blenheim, 409: intervenes in Scotch affairs, 411–3: is attacked by Convocation, 414: views on situation, 414–6: conduct and treatment during elections of 1705; the affair of Dean Younger, 416–9, 419 n: his politico-ecclesiastical views, 1705–6, 420–2: share in Union debates, 425–6: attains "climacteric," 426: education of his sons, 426–8: views in 1707–8, 430–34: epilogue of History, 434–7: is slandered by Mrs Manley, 438–9: loses his wife; retires to Clerkenwell; his "lectures" and associates, 439–41: is insulted by Sacheverell; takes part in prosecution; remonstrates with Queen Anne; quarrels with Salisbury Corporation, 441–5: writes his autobiography; is again attacked by Mrs Manley; wins an action of Scandalum Magnatum, 445–6: views on situation; advises Queen, 446–8: votes for an Occasional Conformity Bill, 449: anecdotes concerning him, 449–50: parliamentary action, 450–2, 451 n: attitude towards Whiston and Dodwell, 452–4, 454 n: relations with his sons, 455–7: attitude towards the Treaties of Utrecht, 457–9: brings his History to a close, 459: fears a Popish Restoration and resumes his Reformation History; controversies on the subject; virulence of electoral contest; Burnet's apprehensions, 459–67: his violent support of Clarke, 467: his last visitation; returns to London; sends news of the Queen's death; holds his last ordination; preaches before King George, 467–70: anecdotes of his last months, 470–1: deprecates his son's violence; patronizes non-jurors, 471–3: last illness; death and burial, 473–4, 474 n: his memory insulted, 474, 474 n: his Will and posthumous History, 474–5: descendants and portraits, 474 n: character, 127–8, 476–84

Burnet, Gilbert, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury; *His Opinions* (see also under Arminianism, Calvinism, Deism, Erastianism, High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Jesuit, Nonconformist, Non-resistance, Resistance, Protestant (Continental and French), Roman Catholic, Socinianism, Toleration, Tory, Whig, and contemporary Proper Names *passim*):—

Absolution, priestly, 453, 468: Accomplishments, 73: Advowsons, sale of, 294, 298: Alexander the Great, 355: Architecture, 73, 212: Art, 211–2: Atonement, doctrine of, 321–3: Augustine, 366, 366 n, 367: Bacon ("Lord"), 202: Baptism, 324, 366–7, 408, 453: Beaumont and Fletcher, 180, 180 n, 202: Bishops, Parliamentary functions of, 63–4, 268, 340–1: Blasphemy, 346–7: Buchanan, George, 313: Chronology, 152, 152 n: Cicero, 312: Classics, study of, 73, 151, 228, 312–3, 436: Clergy, English Dissenting, 37–9, 402: Clergy, English Episcopal, 38–9, 171, 274, 290–5, 298, 305, 310–5, 325, 341, 368, 404, 414–6, 457, 462, 471: Clergy, Scots Episcopal, 27–30, 34–6, 44, 61–9, 85–6, 97, 123, 176, 305–6: Clergy, Scots Presbyterian, 15–6, 24–5, 30, 91, 97, 305–6: Confession, Auricular, 366, 468: Confirmation, 290–1, 324: Conquest, argument from, 273–4, 317: "Conversion," religious, 148–9, 179: Consensus Helvetius, 214: Corruption, Parliamentary and electoral, 316, 434: Country gentlemen, 73, 435–6: Demosthenes, 313: "Desertion," doctrine of, 255–7, 261–2: Discipline, Ecclesiastical, English, 166, 293, 313: Discipline, Ecclesiastical, Scottish, 58–9, 65–6: Divine Right of Kings, 10, 23, 97, 139, 145, 442–3: Divorce, 103–4, 180, 245, 261, 320, 348: Duels, 464: Education, 17–20, 34, 49, 51, 55, 58–9, 60, 65, 69, 72–3, 79, 81–4, 295–6, 355, 377–8, 426–8, 436, 465: Endowments, parochial, 166, 168, 183, 294, 344–5: Episcopacy, 23–4, 27, 34, 61–8, 95, 111, 146–7, 183, 287–8, 305, 313, 324, 388: Epictetus, 312: Excommunication, 281, 313: Free-trade, 459: Free-

will (see Arminianism, Calvinism), 321–2: French language, 73, 199: Gardening, 73, 312: German language, 73: Ghiberti, Lorenzo, 211: Greek, study of, 73, 436: Greek Church, 162–3, 278, 348–9, 366: Hebrew, study of, 48, 73: Hell-Torments, 313, 366: Hieracles, 312: History, 73, 151, 313, 428, 434: Holbein, 211: House of Commons, value of, 228, 238: Incarnation, doctrine of, 226–8, 321–2, 333–4: Incense, 454: Infallibility, 161–3, 321, 323: Inspiration, 322, 483: Italian language, 73, 181, 213: Judaism, 48, 226–8: Julius Cæsar, 355: à Kempis, Thomas, his *Imitation of Christ*, 312: Latin language, 73, 226, 275, 275 n: Law Reform, 435, 435 ftn: Lent, 279, 324: Liturgies, 65, 324: Locke, 359: Logic, 73, 428: Marcus Aurelius, 312: Marriage of the Clergy, 367: Mathematics, 34, 45, 48, 51, 136, 322: Mechanics, 49, 73: Metaphysics, 309, 321–2, 482: Michael Angelo, 211: Milton, John, 180, 180 n: Missionaries, Christian, 349, 377–8: "Moderation," 97, 173, 173 n, 318, 416: Mohammedanism, 149, 174, 248, 482: Molinism, 212, 378: More, Sir Thomas, 201–2: Moses, 322: Music, 73: Mysticism, 69–70, 335, 378, 381: Natural Religion, 321–2: Oaths, Judicial, 324: Occult, the (see also Rosicrucianism), 298 n: "Odium theologicum," 314–5: Original Sin, 366: Painting, 73, 211: Paganism, 248: Parity, 228–9: Party spirit, 170–1, 178, 201, 243–4, 269–71, 275, 318–9, 381, 434–5, 465, 480: Patronage, Lay, 184: Philosophy, 73, 227: Philosophy, "Aristotelian," 17, 19: Philosophy ["natural"], see Science, Physical: Philosophy, Platonic, 26, 39: Polygamy, 103: Plutarch, 229, 312: Poetry, 180, 560: Poor, care of [Holland], 50, [Scotland], 59, [England], 435: Preaching, 15, 24–9 *passim*, 30, 46–8, 50–1, 53–4, 57–8, 63–5, 84–5, 291, 313: Predestination (see Arminianism, Calvinism, Free-will), 225, 252, 334, 364, 365, 367–8, 389, 398: Presentations, ecclesiastical, 292: Protection, 459: Purgatory, 366: Quakers, 311, 324–5, 378: Quietism, 378: Reason, 73, 149, 161–2: Rhetoric, 73: Ritualism, 324, 452–5, 462: Sabbatarianism, 17, 24, 59, 295, 314: Satirists, Latin, 312: Science, physical ("natural philosophy"), 34, 37, 39, 48, 51, 53–4, 73, 135–6, 172, 177, 180, 252, 308–9, 367, 475, 477: Shekinah, 227: Slave Trade, 459: Spanish language, 73: Stage, 202, 359, 436: Statuary, 73: Style, 73, 143–4, 180, 202: Subscription, ecclesiastical, 146, 214, 274–6, 281, 325 n, 365–6: Tea-drinking, 506, 560: Tithes, 183, 324–5: "Thebean Legion," the, 335, 472 n: Theologians, English, 312, 364–5: Trading Classes, 435–6: Translation, ecclesiastical, 288, 365: Translation, literary, 143: Transubstantiation, 135, 183, 363, 367: Trinity, doctrine of, 226–8, 325–7, 333–4, 346–8, 348 n: Thuanus, 403, 445, 477: Women, position of, 44, 180, 263, 324, 436

Burnet, Gilbert, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, *Letters from*, see Appendix III and p. x

Burnet, Gilbert, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, *MSS. of*, v, vi, x

Burnet, Gilbert, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, *Works of*, see p. x, Appendix II, and following references in text.

Discourse on...Fletcher of Saltoun... 53–4: Memorial of...Grievances...61–6, 335, 341, 414 n, 436: Thoughts on Education...72–3: Modest and Free Conference ...74–5, 84: Copy of verses (to Duchess Lauderdale), 107–8: Resolution of... Cases of Conscience...103–4, 335, 481: Vindication of...Church and State of Scotland...109–12, 133–4, 137–8, 198, 242, 335, 442: Rome's Glory...117: Mystery of Iniquity...117: Subjection for Conscience sake..., Royal Martyr...134–5, 442: Rational Method...135–6: Relation of a Conference...147: Modest Survey... 146–7, 146–7 n: Account of beginnings ...x, 148–9: Vindication of Ordinations... 147: Mems of...Hamiltons...xi–xvi, 97–100, 115–6, 150–1, 557: Letter...upon... the late Plot...154–5: Unreasonableness ...of Popery...154–5: Relation of [St Bartholomew's Massacre]...154–5: Decree made at Rome...154–5: Reformation, Hist. of xvi–xxii (first two Parts), 150–3, 152 n, 157, 161, 163–6, 168–70, 185, 199, 225, 225 n, 247, 341–2, 361, 374, 557–9; (Part III) 461–4, 471, 472–4, 565: Infallibility of the Roman Church...161–3: [Life of Rochester] xxiii–iv, 166–7, 179, 333, 559: Sermon preached...Sept. 2, 1680...165: Sermon preached...Dec. 22, 1680...168–9: [Life of Hale] xxiv–v, 181: History of Rights of Princes...181–5: News from France...182, 182 n: A Letter writ by the...Assembly General...184–5: Two Sermons preached...before...Russell ...196: [Journal concerning Russell], 196–7: Account of...Russell's...last Speech...197: Essays (unpublished), 201, 248, 328, 475: Utopia...201–2: Life of ...Bedell...202–4, 560, 562: A Sermon preached...Nov. 5, 1684...142 n, 205: Reflections on...Varillas, 220, 225: Some Letters...x, 211–5, 220, 229, 325: Reasons against...Repealing...229–31: ...Reflections on...Toleration in Scotland...229: ...Reflections on...Declaration...dated... 4th of April, 1687, 231–2: Meditation [on

second marriage], 233: [Translation of De Mortibus], 214 n, 248 n, 335, 371 n, 482: [Letters to Middleton], 232–4: Animadversion upon...Reflections...229: Reflections on...Parliamentum Pacificum ...238–9, 239 n: [Second answer to Parl. Pac.], 242: An Apology for the Church of England...243: Some Extracts...237: An Edict in the Roman Law...240: A Censure of [Bossuet], 247: Enquiry into Measures of Submission...x, 237, 244–5, 318: Meditation on my voyage...247–9: Review of Reflections...253–4: [Paper on Ecclesiastical Policy], 257–8: [Paper on Regency Question], 260–1 and *Corrigenda*: Sermon preached...23rd... December, 1688...258–9: Reflections on a Paper...260: Enquiry into...present... affairs...261–2: Sermon preached...31st ...Jan. ...1688...263: Meditation on... Consecration, 287–8: Sermon preached at...Coronation...267: Pastoral Letter... 273–4, 317–8, 374: Sermon [June 5, 1689], 275: ...Sermon preached...26 Novemb. 1689...282: Sermon preached ...March 12, $16\frac{8}{9}\frac{9}{0}$...284–5: ...New... Homilies...280–1, 458: Injunctions for the Archdeacons...294: Short directory ...290: Sermon [on]...the reduction of Ireland...306: Sermon preached [at Boyle's funeral], 308–9, 349: Pastoral Care...309–14, 457–8: Sermon [on victory of La Hogue], 308: Four Discourses ...320–6: Sermon [at Tillotson's funeral] ...328–9: Letter [to Williams], 333–4: Essay on...the late Queen...331: Animadversions on...Hill...334: Reflections [upon Hickes], 335: Memorial concerning...First-Fruits...344–5: [Ryswick Memorials], 343, 414: Sermon [on peace of Ryswick], 344, 348: Second Memorial [on First-Fruits], 345: Exposition of the ...Articles...225, 290, 325, 364–8, 388–9, 398: Charitable Reproof...376–7: Reflections [on Atterbury], 375–6: First Sermon [preached before Queen Anne], 393: Remarks on...Examination...368: ...Speech...upon the Bill against Occasional Conformity...406–7: Sermon... for the...exiles of...Orange...214 n: Of the Propagation of the Gospel...378: Because Iniquity...421 n: Sermon preached ...31 Dec. 1706...424–5: Letter [for] the Triennial Visitation...1708, 433: Preface [to his wife's Method], 439: Speech [on Sacheverell's Trial], 441–3: Exposition of...Catechism...454: Rough Draught...[Autobiography], its composition, 445, 475: ...Letters [to Dodwell], 453–4: New Preface [to Pastoral Care], 457–8: Preface [to some Sermons], 458: Introduction [to 3rd vol. Reformation], 462–4: Sermon preached...March 29, 1714...465–6: [Final charge], 468–9: Sermon preached before...King George... 470: Will, vi, 474–5: Memoirs, composition of, 187 n, 187–8, 192, 198, 206, 233, 248–9, 306–7, 339, 370, 403–5, 407, 434, 474 n: Hist. Own Time, composition of, xi, xxvi *et sqq.*, 187, 403–5, 434–7, 459, 475, 475 n

Burnet, Gilbert, Professor of Philosophy at Basel and Montauban, 4

Burnet, Gilbert, second son of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 352 n, 426–8, 456, 467, 474–5

Burnet, James, uncle of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 4, 9

Burnet, Lady, wife of Thomas, brother of Gilbert Burnet, 31

Burnet, Lady Margaret, born Kennedy, 1st wife of Gilbert Burnet, afterwards Bishop, 44, 72, 104–5, 112–3, 131–2, 139–40, 208–9, 281 n

Burnet, Mary, born Scott, 2nd wife of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 224 n, 224–5, 232, 233, 235, 249, 266, 295, 309, 352–4, 362, 378, 379, 428–9, 533, 562–3

Burnet, Mary, daughter of Bishop Gilbert Burnet (Mrs Mitchell), 309, 352, 474–5

Burnet, Rachel, born Johnston, mother of Gilbert Burnet, afterwards Bishop, 7–9, 16, 18, 24–5, 36, 37, 45, 69, 70, 84, 124, 186

Burnet, Rachel, see Nicholson

Burnet, Robert, afterwards Lord Crimond, father of Gilbert Burnet, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, 4–12, 14–21, 24, 45, 55, 119, 242, 403, 477

Burnet, Robert, brother of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 17, 25

Burnet, Thomas, Sir, 1st Baronet of Leys, 4, 9

Burnet, Thomas, Sir, 3rd Baronet of Leys, 564

Burnet, Thomas, Sir, brother of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 17, 25, 31, 186

Burnet, Thomas, Sir, son of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 159, 268, 291, 295–7, 299, 336, 426–9, 455–7, 464, 467, 471–5, 474 n

Burnet, Thomas of the Charter house, 556

Burnet, Thomas (Kenmay), 360, 395–6, 426 n

Burnet, William, eldest son of Bishop Gilbert Burnet, 237, 249, 426–9, 455–6, 467, 474–5

Burnet, Mrs William, born Stanhope, 455

Burnet House, 440, 440 n

Burnett, James, Lord Monboddo, 4

Burnett of Leys, family of, 3 n, 3–4, 7, 476

Burnett, Thomas, Sir, 12th Baronet of Leys [1906], 3

Butler, James, 2nd Duke of Ormond, 450

"Cabal," the, 87

Calamy, Edmund, 397–402, 406

Calder, Curate, 83 ftn

Calderwood, Mrs, 59 n
Calixtus, 363
Calvinism, Calvinists, 19, 49, 84, 146, 174, 183, 214, 225, 252, 312, 361–6, 368, 396, 398
Cambridge, University of, 39, 292, 364, 427–8
  Corpus Christi College, 157
  St John's College, 157, 461, 472
  Trinity College, 427–8
Camden, William, 151
Campagna of Rome, the, 212
Campbell, Archibald, Marquis of Argyll, 13, 40
Campbell, Archibald, Lord Lorn, 9th Earl of Argyll, 33, 101, 117–8, 176, 177, 209–10, 232
Campbell, John, 2nd Duke of Argyll, 410
Canons, the, 274, 277
Canons, abortive, of the English Reformers, 320
"Cant, the True Spirit of," 200 n
Canterbury, Archbishops of, see Sancroft, Tenison, Tillotson
Capel, Arthur, 1st Earl of Essex, 167, 170–173, 186–7, 189–94, 193 n, 201, 270, 270 n
Capel, Elizabeth, Lady Essex, born Percy, 193, 201, 270 n
Carlisle, Bishop of [Dr Thomas Smith], 267
Carolina, 186
Carstares, William, 109, 282, 410, 451
Carthage, Council at, 280
Casal, capture of, 337
Cassilis, see Kennedy
Catalans, desertion of the, 459
Catechism, of the English Church, the, 279, 290, 296, 454; of the Scottish, 65
Catherine of Braganza, wife of Charles II, 103–4, 156
Causa Sanguinis, bishop's judging in, 64, 340–1
Cavalier, see Royalist
"Cavalier" interest [1703–4], 410, 425
Cavendish, William, 4th Earl and 1st Duke of Devonshire, friend of Lord Russell, 189
Cevennes, Risings in the, 424–5
Chamberlain, the Lord [1674], 125
Chambery, Burnet at, 211
Chancellor, Lord, of England in 1679 [Heneage Finch, 1st Earl of Nottingham], 157
Chancellor of Scotland [1662], see Glencairn
"Charity Organization," see Burnet, Bishop Gilbert, views of (Poor, care of the)
Charles I, King, 7–13, 22, 98–100, 116, 134–5, 139, 242, 245, 344, 412–3, 415, 442–3, 524, 525, 528
Charles II, King, 13–5, 19, 20–4, 36, 40–4, 52, 68, 69, 70, 74–8, 85–7, 89, 90, 103, 105–6, 108, 112, 114–8, 120, 122–5, 131–2, 134–5, 153–61, 166, 169, 170, 172, 174–6, 177–8, 188, 191–200, 198 n, 205, 206, 255, 258, 391, 405, 416, 532, 543, 557, 560
Charles II, King of Spain, 350, 382–4
Charles III, titular King of Spain, afterwards Emperor Charles VI, 447, 449
Charteris, Laurence, 25–7, 35, 46–7, 55, 59 n, 61–2, 92 n, 93, 105, 113, 173, 176, 220, 311, 367, 369
Chemistry, 39, 73, 172, 177, 308–9
Chesterfield, see Stanhope
Cheyne, Dr George, 473
Chichester, see of, 155
Chiffinch, William, 156, 160, 161
Chillingworth, William, 323, 365
China, Empire of, 349, 378
Chippenham, election at, 417–8
Chiswell, Richard, Printer, 148, 204, 204 n, 425 ftn, 564; and Bibliography *passim*
Chivers, Colonel, 417–8
Christmas, Mr, 440 n
Chrysostom, 69, 311–3
Church lands, 3, 9, 393
Church of England, 38, 39, 105–6, 114, 140–7, 182–3, 243–5, 247, 262, 269, 271–84, 289–99, 301–5, 318, 320, 323–4, 327–9, 332–3, 344–5, 361–8, 374–8, 384, 386–8, 393, 395–404, 406–8, 413–23, 419 n, 426, 435–6, 438, 441–7, 449, 452–5, 467, 471, 474
Church of Scotland, see Presbyterianism, Scotch, and Episcopacy, Scotch
Churchill, Awnsham and John, 425 ftn
Churchill, John, Lord Churchill, Earl and Duke of Marlborough, 254, 260, 307–8, 350–1, 357–8, 382, 386–7, 390, 394–5, 399–400, 405–6, 408–10, 416, 419, 421–4, 429–34, 437–8, 440–1, 449–50, 482
Churchill, Sarah, Lady Churchill, Countess and Duchess of Marlborough (born Jennings), 307–8, 350–1, 357, 381–2, 390, 394, 406, 408–9, 419, 419 n, 429–32, 438, 440, 445, 449
Cicero, 312
Civil Law, 103–4, 240
Civil War, temp. Charles I, 11–5, 284, 442–3
Clarendon, Earls of, see Hyde
Clarke, Dr Samuel, 456, 467, 467 n
Classes, Act of [Scotland], 13, 14
Claude, M. (Protestant Minister), 185
Clifford, Thomas, Lord, 87
Clogie, Alexander, 202–3
Cockburn, Catherine, born Trotter, 548
Cockburn, Dr John, 17, 46–8, 53, 56, 62, 66–7, 98, 429, 548
Cohan, Eve, 527
Colbatch, John, 293, 333, 427–8, 563–4
Coleman, Edward, 147, 153–4, 156 ftn, 474 n
Collier, Jeremy, 273, 359

Colonies, the English (and see Carolina and Massachusetts Bay), 378, 459, 481
Colt, Sir W. Dutton, 283–4, 284 n, 562
Comber, Dr Thomas, 182–4, 182 n, 225, 560
Commercial Treaty (of Utrecht), 459
Commination Service, Reform of the, 279
Committee of Estates [Scotland], 11, 15
Commonwealth (of England), 16
Commonwealth'smen, see Republicanism
Communion, Sacrament of Holy, 274, 278–9, 324, 334, 348, 366–8, 452–3
Comprehension, Religious, English schemes of, 145–7, 243, 263, 271, 274–83
Comprehension, Religious, Scottish schemes of (see also "Accommodation"), 72, 87–97, 305, 318–9, 338
Compton, Dr Henry, Bishop of London, 169, 197, 217 n, 217–9, 223–4, 240–1, 265, 267, 343, 401, 420, 560, 564
Constance, Council of, 360
Constantius, Emperor, 321
Constantinople, siege of, 284
Conventicles, and Conventicle Acts (Scottish), 41, 43, 61, 63, 80, 86, 89–92, 94, 96, 108, 109, 113
Convention of 1688–9 (English), 259–83
Convention of Royal Burghs (Scottish), 122
Convocation, 268, 274–6, 278, 282–3, 375–6, 384–5, 387–8, 395, 397, 402–3, 408, 422, 426, 438, 447, 452, 467
Cook, Mr Patrick, 92 n, 93
Cooper, Anthony Ashley, Lord Ashley, and 1st Earl of Shaftesbury, 87, 118, 145, 154, 158, 167–9, 185–6, 228
Corporation Bill (of 1690), 283
Cotton, Sir Robert, 152, 152 ftn, 157, 164
Councils, Œcumenical, 360
Counter Reformation, The, 298, 310
"Country Party" (Parliamentary Opposition of 1667–79), 132–3, 136–9, 144–7, 150, 153–60, 167
Court of Delegates, 423
Covenant, National League and, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 23, 28, 40, 42, 63, 81, 88, 451
Covenant, Solemn League and, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, 28, 40, 42, 88, 139
Covenanters, 9–15, 18, 22, 30, 52, 75, 105, 126, 451
Coventry, Secretary Henry, 115–7, 132, 557
Coventry, Sir William, 145, 532
Cowley, Abraham, 33 n, 180
Cowper, William, Lord Cowper (Lord Chancellor), 357, 419, 422, 441, 443
Craig, John (divine and mathematician), 293, 293 n, 298 n, 428
Craig, Thomas, Sir, 8
Cranmer, Archbishop, 247, 471
Crauford, see Lindsay
Crew or Crewe, Nathaniel, Lord, Bishop of Durham, 258, 265
Crimond (Aberdeenshire), 6, 16
Crimond, Lord, see Burnet, Robert
Crizzo, Niccolo, a Venetian Envoy, 431, 431 n, 565
Crocket, Mr Gilbert, 83
Croft, Dr Herbert, Bishop of Hereford, 146, 524
Cromwell, Oliver, 14–6, 28, 40, 88, 139, 207, 210
Cuddesdon, Theological College at, 292–3
Cunningham, Alexander, the historian, 78 n, 84, 246, 251 n, 252 n, 282 n, 298 n, 317 n, 393 n
Cunningham, William, 9th Earl of Glencairn, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, 27, 31

D'Albeville, see White
Dalkeith, 14
Dalrymple, Sir James, 1st Viscount Stair, 118, 282, 282 n
Dalrymple, Sir James, of Borthwick, 2nd son of above, 461
Dalrymple, Sir John, Master and 1st Earl of Stair, 232, 306, 338–9, 461
Danby, Earl of, see Osborne
"Darien" scheme, 338–9, 374, 410–1, 413, 425–6
D'Avaux, Comte, 234, 234 n
Dartmouth, Earl of, see Legge
Dauphin of France ("Monsieur"), 200, 437
Davenant, John, Bishop of Salisbury, 398
David I, King of Scotland, 3
Davies, Rev. Richard, 562
Dean of Glasgow [1689], see Glasgow
Defoe, Daniel, 417–8
Deism, Deists, 164, 312, 326, 346–8, 422, 452–3
Deponing, Act anent [Scotland], 90
D'Estrees, Cardinal, 213
De Thou, see Burnet, *Opinions* of (Thuanus)
"Devizes, The," 290, 294 n
Devonshire, Earl and Duke of, see Cavendish
"Dionysius the Areopagite," 280
Dirleton, parish of, 54, 60
Dissent, Dissenters, English, see Nonconformist
Dodwell, Henry (the elder), 453–4, 549
Donatists, the, 280
Dorsetshire, 417
Dort, Synod of, 185, 388 ftn, 398
Douglas, George, Earl of Dumbarton (brother of Duke Hamilton), 155
Douglas, John, Bishop of Carlisle and of Salisbury, 4 ftn
Douglas, James, Earl of Arran and 4th Duke of Hamilton, 161, 177, 197, 209, 209 n, 410, 425, 457
Douglas, James, 4th Earl and 2nd Duke of Queensberry, 163, 410–2
Douglas, Robert, 14, 24–5, 75
Douglas, William, 3rd Earl and 1st Duke of Queensberry, 163

Douglas, William, 3rd Duke of Hamilton, 83 n, 95, 97–8, 102, 104, 106, 117–9, 122, 125, 132, 136 n, 173, 181, 209, 281, 305 n, 333, 557–8, 562
Douglasses of Tilwhilly, 4 ftn
"Dragonades," the, 210, 213–4, 462
Dover, Treaty of, 87, 105, 114, 463
Drumclog, battle of, 83
Drummond, John, first Earl of Melfort, 534
Drummond, Patrick, 37–8
Dryden, John, 229–31, 230 n, 560
Dryfe Sands, battle of, 7
Duckett, George, 296, 456 n, 457 n, 472 n, 474 n, 556
Dugdale, Sir William, 152 ftn
Dumbarton, Earl of, see Douglas
Du Moulin, Dr Lewis, 527
Du Moulin, Dr Peter, 280
Dunbar, battle of, 14
Duncombe, Sir Charles, 346
Dunkirk, 437
Dunton, John, publisher, 148
Dutch, see United Provinces; guards, 358; language, 348
Dyckveldt, Everard Van, 266
Dysart, Countess of, see Maitland

East Lothian, 60, 78
Ecclesiastical Commissions
  Court of, English, (Charles I), 423
  " " (James II), 216
  for Reform of Liturgy, 1689, 276–81, 276–8 nn, 281 n, 302
  Irish, of 1690, 300
  of 1695–1702, 332 n (bis), 332–3, 374–5, 388, 393
  temp. Queen Victoria, 294
Ecclesiastical Courts, abuses of, in England, 166, 263, 277, 293–4
Edgeworth, Miss, 167
Edict of Nantes, 210, 214, 424, 451
Edinburgh, 7, 9, 10, 14, 20, 27, 34, 36, 45, 51, 55, 69, 89–91, 95, 105, 117, 124, 210, 232, 235, 421
Edinburgh, Abbey, see Holyrood
Edinburgh, Abbey Church of, 26
Edinburgh, Bishop of, see Wishart and Young
Edinburgh, Castle of, 33
Edinburgh, Holyrood Abbey or Palace, 90, 91, 117, 120
Edinburgh, Presbytery of, 14, 20
Edinburgh, University of, 28
Elizabeth, Queen, 207, 344, 442, 444, 461
Emperor, see Leopold I, Joseph I, and Charles VI
Empire, Holy Roman, Affairs of the (see also Germany), 360–2, 408, 458, 465
"Engagement," The, 13, 14, 28
English, Mrs, 38 ftn
Envoy, English, at Versailles, see Graham, Sir Richard, 1st Viscount Preston
Ephesus, Council of, 278
Episcopacy, Scotch, 4–10, 20–3, 26–31, 33–5, 43–5, 52–97, 59 n, 102–13, 115, 122–8, 173–6, 281–2, 305–6, 318–9, 338–9, 410–2, 415, 421, 451 n, 451–2
Episcopius, Simon, 388
Erastianism, 6, 19, 27, 71, 75, 76, 88, 94, 111, 127, 134, 135, 146, 151, 174–6, 181 n, 181–4, 200, 247, 269, 270, 282, 305, 348–9, 375–6, 422–3, 442, 453–4, 479–80, 482–3
Erskine, Lady Frances, Countess of Mar, born Pierrepoint, 450 ftn
"Esmond," 457
Essex, Earl of, see Capel
Eugene, Prince, 423, 449–50
"Evangelists, the Bishops," 92–4
Evelyn, John, 141, 152 n, 264, 344, 371, 475 ftn
Exchequer, stop of the, 106, 114
Exclusionist Party, 158, 165, 167–71, 217, 260
Exeter, 252–4
Exeter, Bishop of, see Trelawny
Exeter, Dean of, 252

Fabricius, Joannes Albertus, 388 n
Fagel, Pensionary Gaspar, 237, 243, 282 n
Fairfax, Thomas, 3rd Baron Fairfax, 350
Fairfoul, Dr, Archbishop of Glasgow, 27, 30
Fall, James (afterwards Historiographer for Scotland, Rector of Glasgow University, and Nonjuror), 163, 179, 181, 182 n, 184–6, 203, 219–21, 329, 348–50, 368–70, 557, 560–1, 563–4
Farringdon, Dr, 312
Farnese Bull, 212
Farnese Palace (Rome), 212
Fathers, early Christian, 34, 49, 226–7, 312, 334, 454 n
Fatio, Faccio, or Facio, M, 217 n, 563
Fell, John, D.D., afterwards Bishop of Oxford, 39, 328
Fénelon, François, Archbishop of Cambrai, 378, 381
Fenwick, Sir John, 339–43, 340 n, 481
Fenwick, Lady Mary, born Howard, 342
"Ferguson the Plotter," Robert, 187 n, 213 n, 555
Feversham, 256, 259, 262
"'Fifteen,' The" (rebellion of 1715), 474
"Filioque," the Clause, 278, 278 n, 349
Finch, Daniel, 2nd Earl of Nottingham, 269, 271, 274, 405–6, 409, 413, 448–9
Finch, Dr, Warden of All Souls, 258, 294, 294 n, 563
Finch, Heneage, 1st Earl of Nottingham, see Chancellor, Lord
Finch, Heneage, 2nd son of Chancellor (afterwards Earl of Aylesford), 317
Firmin, Mr Thomas, 326

Firth, Professor, viii, 178 n, 474 n
Fitzwilliam, Dr John, 273
Fleetwood, Dr William, afterwards Bishop of Ely, 419 n
Fleming, Margaret, born Lindsay, Countess of Wigton, 450 ftn
Fletcher of Saltoun, family of, 56, 58
Fletcher, Sir Andrew, brother to Sir Robert, 53
Fletcher, Andrew, of Saltoun, son of Sir Robert, 51, 60, 73, 410, 522
Fletcher, Lady, of Saltoun, 53, 58
Fletcher, Sir Robert, of Saltoun, 45–6, 48, 49, 51, 53–4, 55, 522
Florence, 211
Fontainebleau, 199
Forbes, Patrick, Bishop of Aberdeen 7
Forbes, William, afterwards Bishop of Edinburgh, 7
Fowler, Dr Edward (afterwards Bishop of Gloucester), 257–8
Fox, Mr Charles, 417, 417 n, 418–9
Fox, Charles James, 206, 417
Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, 312, 463–4
Frampton, Dr Robert, Bishop of Gloucester, 302
France, 5, 36, 50–1, 87, 153, 181–5, 199–200, 209–11, 213–4, 216, 222, 236, 238, 259, 263, 269, 275, 300, 307–8, 321, 336–7, 339, 344 n, 350, 358, 360–2, 378, 382–90, 393–6, 407–9, 414, 423–5, 429–31, 433–5, 437–8, 441, 447–9, 451, 458–60, 462–3, 465, 481, 529–30
"Free Love," 348
Freethinkers, see Libertines
Friezeland, 215
Fulman, William, 163, 163 n, 166, 557, 558, 559

Gallicanism, 135, 181–3, 199–200, 213, 247, 327, 360, 406
Galloway, Bishop of, see Hamilton and Sydserf, Thomas
Geddes, Dr Michael, 293
Gee, Dr, 315 ftn
Geneva, 211, 214, 225, 455, 474 n
George of Denmark, Prince, 254, 396, 399–402, 406, 437
George I, King, see Hanover
Germany, 215, 429–30, see also Empire, the Holy Roman
Glasgow, Archbishops of, see Burnet (Alexander), Fairfoul, and Leighton
Glasgow, City of, 78, 80, 122, 175
Glasgow, Dean of [1689], 281
Glasgow, Diocese of, 30, 71–4, 76–126 *passim*
Glasgow, Synod of, 76
Glasgow, University of, 78, 81–5, 92, 122, 126, 163, 219, 328, 368, 427
Glasgow University, Rector of, see Ramsay
Glencairn, see Cunningham
Glencoe (Macdonalds, and massacre of), 306, 306 n, 318, 318 n, 338–9, 411, 461
"Gloria Patri," recitation of, 57, 65
Gloucester, William, Duke of, son of Queen Anne, 336, 350–6, 374, 378, 381–2, 382 n, 386
Godfrey, Sir Edmund Berry, 154
Godolphin, Sydney, 1st Earl of Godolphin, 317, 351, 358, 406, 409, 412, 414, 416, 418–9, 420, 422, 426, 431–3, 438, 443, 446, 482, 564
Goodwin, or Godwin, Dr Timothy, afterwards Bishop of Kilmore and Archbishop of Cashel, 439
Gosling, a Dutch field deputy, 357 n
Graham, James, 1st Marquis of Montrose, 12
Graham, John, of Claverhouse, 1st Viscount Dundee, 281, 281 n
Graham, Sir Richard, 1st Viscount Preston, English Envoy at Versailles, 199–200
Grandval the conspirator, 308
"Green Ribbon" Club, 188
Greenshields, Mr, 451–2
Greenwich Hospital, 330, 332
Gregory, Saint, 69
Grenoble, 211
Grey, Lady Jane, 191
Grimston, Sir Harbottle, 139, 157, 171, 205, 443
Grimston, Lady, 139
"Groaning Board" pamphlets, 171 n, 200 n
Groningen, 215
Grotius, Hugo, 10, 12, 179, 312, 477, 479
Guthrie, Henry, see Guthry
Guthrie, James, 20, 40, 45
Guthrie, William [a fugitive minister], 69
Guthrie, William, the Protester, 470–1
Guthry, or Guthrie, Henry, Bishop of Dunkeld, 98

Hackman, Mr, 563
Haddington, parish of, 54, 60–1
Haddington, Presbytery of, 52, 54, 60, 92
Hague, the, 49, 215–50 *passim*, 351, 379, 390, 429
Hale, Sir Matthew, 181, 528
Halewyn, Corneille Terestein de, 228–9, 232
Halifax, Earl of, see Montague
Halifax, Viscount, Earl and Marquis of, see Savile
"Halifax" character of Burnet, 271, 271 n, 289, 289 n, 473, 478 ftn
Hall, Dr John, Bishop of Bristol, 364
Hall, Timothy, Bishop of Oxford, 258
Halton, Lord, see Hatton
Hamilton, see also Douglas
Hamilton, Dr, Bishop of Galloway, 27 [one of the "four" bishops]
Hamilton family, 131, 140, 443
Hamilton Palace, 72, 73, 74, 78, 97, 104, 136 n, 139, 221, 305 n

Hamilton, Anne, Duchess of, 72, 97–8, 119, 137, 451, 451 n, 461 (for her husband and sons see Douglas)
Hamilton, James, 1st Duke of Hamilton, 13, Burnet's *Memoirs* of, 97–100, 115, 118–9, 134, 150–1, 525, 557
Hamilton, Janet, 3
Hamilton, Prebendary, 3
Hamilton, Sir Robert, Bart., 83
Hamilton, William, 2nd Duke of Hamilton, Burnet's *Memoirs* of, 97–100, 115, 118–9, 134, 150–1, 525, 557
Hammond, Dr Henry, 312, 365
Hampton Court, 275, 384 n
Hanover, 360, 429–30
Hanover, House of, 360, 362, 382, 385, 387, 389, 410–12, 420, 425, 429–30, 441, 446, 457, 465–70
Hanover, Ernest Augustus, Duke and afterwards Elector of, 245–6, 336, 338, 338 ftn, 362
Hanover, George Lewis, Elector of, afterwards King George I, 382, 396, 429–30, 458, 460, 469–70, 472–3, 550
Hanover, Sophia, Duchess and afterwards Electress of, 245–6, 270, 335–8, 339, 360, 362, 370–1, 382, 385, 387, 395–6, 420, 429–30, 456, 469, 556, 563, 564
Hapsburg, see Austria
Harley, Abigail, 441
Harley, Sir Edward (father of Robert), 176, 185 n, 194, 199, 202, 203, 205–7, 370, 560–1
Harley, Robert, afterwards 1st Earl of Oxford, 370, 387, 389, 410, 413, 416, 422, 431–2, 438, 446–7, 451, 460–1, 466, 467 ftn, 469, 471
"Harmer, Anthony," pseudonym, 153, 543
Harris, Mr, 417
Hatton, Charles, Lord, see Maitland
Hatton, Charles (letter to Moses Pitt), 133
Hay, John, 2nd Earl and 1st Marquis of Tweeddale, 45–8, 55, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 86, 87, 92, 94, 95, 101, 101 n, 117, 121
Hay, John, 2nd Marquis of Tweeddale, 410–1
Hearne, Thomas, 379
Henry II, King, 340
Henry III of France, 160
Henry IV of France, 336
Henry VII, King, Act of (1494), 261
Henry VIII, King, 150, 157, 276, 311, 340, 344, 537
Hepburn, Elisabeth Lady, born Johnston, daughter of Warriston, 55
Herbert, Arthur, Admiral, afterwards Earl of Torrington, 240–1, 251–3, 259–60, 561–2
Herbert, Edward, Baron Herbert of Cherbury, 151
Hermingstone, see St Clair
Hickes, George, Dr (non-juror Bishop), 99, 153, 197, 256, 335, 452–3, 472, 472 n
High (or "rigid") Churchmen, 95, 127–8, 269, 271, 274, 276–7, 281–3, 298–9, 304–5, 311, 314, 318, 320, 335, 368, 375–6, 384, 388, 395, 403, 410, 414–6, 441–3, 452–5, 457, 471, 479
Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII), 134, 280
Hill, Samuel (afterwards Archdeacon of Wells), 334, 544
Hill, Timothy, 559
Hoadly, Benjamin, afterwards Bishop of Bangor, etc., 420, 456
Hobbes, Thomas, 134, 453, 480
Holland, see United Provinces
Holles, Denzil, Lord, 139, 154, 443
Homilies, the, 280–1, 283, 442
Hooker, Richard, 27, 323, 364
Hooper, Dr George, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, 351, 454 n
Horneck, Dr Anth., 257–8, 267, 267 n, 529
Houblon, Mr James, 529
Hough, Dr, Bishop of Oxford, etc., 346
Howard, Edward Henry, Cardinal, 213
Howard, Henry, 7th Duke of Norfolk, 320
Howard, Lady Mary, Duchess of Norfolk, born Mordaunt, 320
Howard, William, 3rd Baron Howard of Escrick, 187–90, 194, 200
Howard, William, 1st Viscount Stafford, 169
How [Howe], Dr John, 219
How or Howe, John Grubham ("Jack"), 317
Howe, see How
Huguenot, see Protestant, French
Humbie, parish of, 55
Humphreys (Humphrey, Humphry), Laurence, 364
Hungarians, 408
Hutcheson, George, 25, 75, 91, 95
Hutton, Dr John, 535
Hyde, Edward, Chancellor, 1st Earl of Clarendon, 87, 98, 331, 403, 407, 413, 443
Hyde, Henry, 2nd Earl of Clarendon, eldest son of Chancellor, 271, 403
Hyde, Laurence, Earl of Rochester, 2nd son of Chancellor, 177, 179, 271, 343, 350–1, 403, 403 n, 406, 417, 420–1

Independents, 15, 378, 456, 469–70
Indulgence, English, Declaration of (temp. Charles II), 106, 108, 114 (temp. James II), First, 231, Second, 239
Indulgence, the Scottish, First, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 96, 102, 108; Second, 109 (see also 103), 113
Ireland, affairs of, 11, 109, 238, 283, 286, 306–8, 372–3, 417, 436, 562
Irenical project, the, 360–4, 396 ftn 3
Irish Forfeiture Debates, 372–3
Irvine, Alexander, 83
Isaiah, prophecies of, 165
Isle of Wight, 401
Italy, 211–13, 261, 389, 423, 455, 535

Jacobites, 32, 53, 133, 134, 213 n, 253, 264, 269, 270 n, 273, 275–6, 280, 281–2, 295, 301, 303–4, 308, 319, 327–9, 335, 339–43, 358–9, 371–2, 379, 387, 391, 394, 404, 406–7, 410–2, 418, 425, 429, 433, 444, 447, 452, 460–6, 474, 556 [see also Nonjurors]
James, the Apostle, 323
James I, King of Great Britain and Ireland, 6, 22, 205, 280, 344, 442 [see also James VI, King of Scotland]
James VI, King of Scotland, 4, 7 [see also James I, King of Great Britain and Ireland]
James, Duke of York, afterwards James II, 87, 103, 116–7, 120, 125–6, 131–6, 138, 147, 153–4, 155 n, 156–8, 157 n, 165, 170, 176, 186, 188, 197, 198, 205, 206, 207–10, 213, 215–7, 221–3, 229–42, 230 n, 245, 247, 250, 253–62, 271–2, 274 n, 276, 285–6, 300, 303, 307–8, 319, 339, 343–4, 377, 379, 390–1, 538–9, 545
James Edward ("the old Pretender"), 238, 240, 245, 252–4, 259, 262, 336, 372, 382, 390, 393–4, 409, 423, 429–30, 433, 435, 442, 444, 458–62, 466, 469
Jane, Dr William, 282–3
Jansenists, 182 (see also Port Royal)
Jebb, Dr John, Bishop of Limerick, 484
Jeffreys, George, Lord Chancellor, 1st Baron Jeffreys, 236
Jerome, 311
Jersey, Earl of, see Villiers
Jerusalem, 284, 468, 479
Jesuit, Jesuitism, 50, 135, 136, 182, 240, 248, 349, 378, 459, 523–4, 526, 555
Jesus Christ, 54, 134, 162, 226–8, 288, 291, 311, 322–3, 324, 326–7, 349, 366, 453, 474
Jewel, Dr John, Bishop of Salisbury, 312, 364, 442
John, the Apostle, 322
Johnson, Samuel, Chaplain to Lord Russell, 271, 317 n
Johnson, Dr, the lexicographer, 166, 296 n
Johnston, family of, 7–8, 18, 25, 476
Johnston, Archibald, grandfather of Rachel Burnet, born Johnston, 7
Johnston, Archibald, afterwards Lord Warriston, 8–15, 18, 20, 36, 38 ftn, 40–1, 44, 118, 124, 193, 235
Johnston, Elisabeth [born Craig, mother of Rachel Burnet, born Johnston], 8
Johnston, Helen, "Lady" Warriston [born Morison], 36, 38 ftn, 40
Johnston, James [father of Rachel Burnet, born Johnston], 8
Johnston, James, son of Lord Warriston ("Mr Secretary"), 236, 236 n, 300–1, 301 n, 305–6, 306 n, 318 n, 318–9, 338–9, 360, 410–2, 424–6, 475, 562
Johnston, Rachel [born Arnot], 7–8
Jones, Dr Edward, Bishop of St Asaph, 359
Jones, Sir William, 150, 172
Jonson, Ben, 180, 202
Joseph I, The Emperor, 447–8
Judas, Burnet portrayed as, 464
Julian the Apostate, tracts on, 204 n, 317 n
Jurieu, Pierre, 325, 561–2
Justinian II, 344

Keeling, Josiah, 188–9
Keith, George, 34, 378
Kelsey, Mr, 423
Ken, J., a Jesuit, 135–6, 523, 524
Ken, Dr Thomas, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 240, 277, 302–3, 358, 454 n, 562
Kennedy, Andrew, 107 n
Kennedy, John, 5th Earl of Cassilis, 44, 113
Kennedy, Lady Margaret, see Burnet
Kennett, Dr White, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough, 378, 419 n, 452
"Kent Petition," 389
Kincardine, Earl of, see Bruce
Kincardineshire, 3
King, Dr William, Principal of St Mary Hall, Oxford, 295, 295 n
Kirke, Colonel Percy, 236
Kirkton, James, 83, 85, 93
Kneller, Sir Godfrey, 475
Knox, Alexander, 484
Knox, John, 57, 314
Krämer, Dr, 331

Lactantius, see Burnet, *Works* (tr. *De Mort.*)
La Hogue, battle of, 308, 543
Lambeth Palace, 328, 348
Lambert, Mr, 292 n
Languedoc, 213, 215, 462
"Latitudinarians" (see also Low Church), 38, 95, 143, 143 n, 145, 277, 298, 304, 314, 332–3, 335, 441 n
Laud, Dr William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 9, 28, 364–5, 415
Lauderdale, Earls and Dukes of, see Maitland
Lauzanne, 211
La Vallière, Louise de, 200
Leaguers, French, 420–1
Le Clerc, John, 214 n, 225, 267–8, 359, 532, 561, 563
Lecky, Mr, his character of Burnet, 476, 476 n
Legge, William, 1st Earl of Dartmouth, 314, 351 n, 352, 358, 373, 391, 412, 446
"Legion Petition," 389
Le Grand, Joachim, 153, 537
Leibnitz, Gottfried, 349, 360, 365–8, 378, 385, 387, 388 n, 389, 389 n, 395–6, 429–30, 452, 563–4
Leighton, Ellis, Sir, 116
Leighton, Robert (father of the Bishop), 28
Leighton, Robert (afterwards Bishop of Dumblane and Archbishop of Glasgow), 6, 15, 27–30, 35, 54, 72, 77, 85, 87–97, 102, 102 n, 105, 107, 113, 121–4, 127, 146, 148–9, 163, 173, 203–4, 314, 365, 367, 477, 484

Leopold I, the Emperor, 360–2, 383
Leslie, Charles, 327, 327 n, 404, 406–7, 443
Leslie, General David, 14, 15
Leslie, John, 7th Earl of Rothes, 40, 61, 70–1, 95, 105, 117
L'Estrange, Sir Roger, 204
Levant Trade, the, 383
Leyden, 49, 428–9, 455, 456
Leys, see Burnett of Leys
"Libertines" (free-thinkers), 50, 321, 468, 470, 474
Licinius, 321
Licenser of Press, 1693 (Edmund Bohun), 317
Licenser of Press at Oxford (Roger Altham, Professor of Hebrew), 334
Lightfoot, Dr John, 312, 365
Limborch, Philip van, 225–8, 275–6, 301–2, 312, 314–5, 322, 326, 346–8, 354–5, 388, 454–5, 455 n, 561–6
Limerick, siege of, 300
Limerick, capitulation of, 372
"Limitation," project of, 158, 167–8, 170–1
Lindsay, Anna Lady Balcarres, afterwards Countess of Argyll (born Mackenzie), 33, 33 n, 36, 37, 51, 176, 450 ftn
Lindsay, Lady Anne, a nun, daughter to Lady Balcarres, 51
Lindsay, Alexander, 1st Earl of Balcarres, 33 n
Lindsay, James, afterwards 5th Earl of Balcarres, 450 ftn, 450 n
Lindsay, John, 17th Earl of Crauford, 37
Lisbon, 333
Littleton, Sir Thomas, the elder, 144, 153, 170
Liturgy, English, Reform of, 274–83, 471
Liturgy, for Switzerland, 396, 396 ftn and n
Lloyd, Dr William, afterwards Bishop of St Asaph, of Lichfield and Coventry, and of Worcester, 143–4, 151, 153–4, 165, 169, 240, 254, 265, 267, 332–3, 543
Lockhart, George, of Carnwath, 460
Locke, John, 228, 244, 267–8, 359, 366, 429, 480
Lombardy, 211
London, 33, 36, 37, 40, 48, 85, 100–4, 114–7, 124–6, and Part II, *passim*
London, Bishops of, see Compton and Robinson
London, city and corporation, 165, 185, 187–8, 255, 527–8, 541, 545, 548, 549, 550
London, Fire of, 141, 165
London, localities in
  Bell Inn, Warwick Lane, 203
  Clerkenwell, 439–41, 440 n, 461, 469, 474
  Highbury, 439
  Holborn,
    Brook Buildings, Brook St, 177
    Furnivall's Inn, 177
    Greville St, 177
London, Holborn, Leather Lane, 177
  Islington, 439
  Lincoln's Inn Fields, 144, 177, 196
  Smithfield, 440, 448, 462, 466, 469
London, Parishes and Churches of
  Bow Church, see St Mary-le-Bow
  Covent Garden, see St Paul's
  The Rolls Chapel, 139, 141–2, 204–5
  St Anne's, Blackfriars, 38
  St Bride's, Fleet St, 465
  St Clement's Danes, 141, 197, 530
  St Giles, Cripplegate, 132 n
  St James, Clerkenwell, 380 n, 474
  St James Palace, Chapel Royal in, 258–60, 356–7, 380 n, 393, 470
  St John's, Clerkenwell, 440–1
  St Lawrence Jewry, 282
  St Margaret's, Westminster, 168
  St Martin's, Westminster, 143, 165
  St Mary-le-Bow, 284, 376, 470
  St Pancras, 154
  St Paul's Cathedral, 141, 171, 267, 424, 441, 443
  St Paul's, Covent Garden, 165
  Temple, The, 172, 450
  Westminster Abbey, 343, (Henry VII Chapel) 282, (Jerusalem Chamber) 277
  Whitehall Palace, Chapel Royal, 282, 344, 380 n
London, Royal Palaces in
  Kensington, 297 n, 343, 392, 469
  St James's, 257–9, 354, 356–7, 392, 400–1, 470
  Whitehall, 120, 153, 156, 257, 259–60, 282, 286
London, Tower of, 36, 38, 137, 157, 189, 190, 201, 240, 270, 342, 343, 373
Londonderry, Bishop of (Dr King), 327 n
"Lords Justices," 337
Louis XIV, King of France, 181–2, 181 n, 184, 199–200, 210, 213–4, 214 n, 236, 237, 249, 337–8, 382, 390, 395, 408, 423–5, 437–8, 448, 451, 462, 481, 529
Louvestein party (Holland), 228
"Low Churchmen" (see also Latitudinarian and Erastian), 403, 416, 457–8, 471
Lowth, Dr Simon, 153, 531
Luther, Martin, 152
Lutheranism, 48, 174, 361–3, 366, 382, 396, 399
Lyons, 211

Mabillon, Father, 454
Macaulay's character of Burnet, 476, 476 n
Maccabees, the, 321
Mackenzie, Sir George of Rosehaugh, 31 n, 44, 77, 137
Mackenzie, Sir George, 1st Viscount Tarbat and Earl of Cromarty, 31, 31 n
Mackenzie, George, 2nd Earl of Seaforth, 33 n
Madder, 421
McWard, Robert, 84, 109

Magdalen College, Fellows of, 237
Mahomedanism, 248, 482
Maidment, James, Scottish antiquary, 108
Maintenon, Madame de, 210
Maitland, Anne, 1st wife of John, 1st Duke of Lauderdale [born Hume], 100–1, 106
Maitland, Charles, "Lord Hatton," afterwards 3rd Earl of Lauderdale, brother of 1st Duke, 114, 120, 125, 125 n
Maitland, Elizabeth, Duchess of Lauderdale [born Murray], Countess of Dysart in her own right, and by first marriage wife of Sir Lionel Tollemache, 87, 100–1, 106–8, 114–5, 117, 120–1, 125, 135 n, 138, 522
Maitland, John, 1st Earl of Lauderdale, 9, 99
Maitland, John, 1st Duke of Lauderdale, vi, x, 22, 36, 37, 40–44, 54, 61, 68, 77–8, 87–91, 95, 100–9, 101 n, 102 n, 107 n, 109 n, 112 n, 111–5, 117–26, 131–8, 136 n, 140, 148, 151–2, 152 ftn, 154, 176, 182–3, 335, 413, 557
Malplaquet, battle of, 441
Manley, Mrs, see *New Atalantis*
Manners, John, 3rd Duke of Rutland, 563
Manton, Thomas, D.D., 38–9
Mar, Lady, see Erskine
Marlborough, see Churchill
Marriage Licenses and Service, reform of, 279
Marseilles, 211
Marston Moor, battle of, 12
Mary I, Queen of England, 165, 186, 191, 461–2, 464
Mary, Princess of Orange, afterwards Queen (Mary II), 170, 215–23, 238, 240, 246, 250, 259, 262–6, 264 n *bis*, 275–6, 286, 300, 303–4, 307–10, 314, 318, 318 n, 325, 329–31, 336, 337, 344, 350–1, 353 ftn, 356, 365, 373, 377–8, 382, 391, 391 n, 455, 539–44
Mary of Modena (Queen of James II), 216, 238, 240, 253–4, 259
Masham, Abigail, Lady (born Hill), 431
Mason, Francis, 280
Massachusetts Bay, Colony of, 456
Mead, Dr Richard, 473
Melfort, Earl of, see Drummond
"Memorial of the Church of England," 414
Methodism, 377, 483–4
"Methuen Treaty," 459
Mews, Dr Peter, Bishop of Winchester, 267
Middleton, Charles, 2nd Earl of Middleton, 232, 234
Middleton, John, 1st Earl of Middleton, 20, 22, 23, 30, 36, 40
Milan, Milanese, 211–2, 423
Militia, Militia Act, English, 156, 156 ftn, 245
Militia Act, Scotch, 78, 114 n, 174–5
Mitchell, James [attempting murderer], 72
"Mohocks," The, 457
Molinism, Molinist, 212, 378
Monboddo, Lord, see Burnett, James
Monmouth, see Mordaunt and Scott
Monroe, Mr John, 83
Montague, Charles, Earl of Halifax, 230 n, 289, 317, 386–7, 437, 472, 564
Montague, Ralph, Baron Montague (afterwards Duke of Montagu), 209–10, 212
Montauban, 4
Montgomery (a Scottish Informer), 286
Montrose, Marquis of, see Graham
Moore, John, Bishop of Norwich and of Ely, 375
Moray, Robert, Sir, 6, 33 n, 36–9, 40, 41, 48, 50, 70, 71, 72, 77, 100 n, 100–1, 103, 114, 118, 121, 153
Mordaunt, Charles, 1st Earl Monmouth and 3rd Earl Peterborough, 217, 342, 423
More, Henry, D.D., 39
More, Sir Thomas, 201, 530
Morinus, Johannes, 280
Morus, Alexandre, 50, 50 n
Mulgrave, Earl of, see Sheffield
"Murder Committee," 283
Murray, John, 2nd Earl and 1st Marquis of Athol, 109
Myner, Lady, 120

Nairn, Mr, 25–7, 34, 46–8, 54, 55, 61, 62, 92 n, 105, 173, 367
Namur, siege of, 337
Napier, Mark, 193
Naples, 211–2
Napleton, Mr, 256
National Debt, 317, 320
Nationalists, Scotch, 410–2, 425
Nazianzen, Gregory, 123, 311
Necessitarianism, 430
Netherlands, Spanish, 50, 423
Neuchatel, 396, 396 n
New Atalantis, the, 438–9, 445, 464
Newbattle, 15
Newfoundland, 459
Newgate Gaol, 194–6
Nicaea, second Council of, 34
Nicene Creed, 278, 467
Nicholson, Rachel, Lady, born Burnet, sister of Gilbert Burnet, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, 17, 25
Nicholson, Sir Thomas, King's Advocate, brother-in-law to Gilbert Burnet, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, 17
Nimeguen, 211
Nonconformist, Nonconformity, English Protestant (see also names of separate denominations), 105–6, 108, 114, 116, 145–7, 185–6, 243–4, 269, 272, 274, 275–83, 297, 299, 311, 318, 321, 323–5, 335, 377, 397–402, 406–8, 414, 416, 445, 453, 467, 469–71, 474 n, 482–3
Nonjurors (see Jacobites), 273, 277, 301–4, 320, 335, 342, 359, 406, 452–4, 454 n, 461, 472–3

Non-residence (ecclesiastical), 63, 166, 294–5, 328, 408
"Non-Resistance," doctrine of, 10, 26, 75, 110–1, 134, 145, 187, 194–8, 208, 220, 241–2, 244–5, 270, 271, 280, 360, 399, 441–3, 453–4
Norfolk, Duke of, see Howard
Nottingham, Earl of, see Finch

Oates, Titus, 153–4, 170, 195, 270
"Occasional Conformity," and Bills and Act against, 397, 399–400, 402, 404, 406–7, 413–4, 417, 449
"October Club," The, 447, 449
Oldmixon, John, 328
Onslow, Speaker, 142, 142 n, 440, 450
Orange, Principality of, 214 n, 547
Orange, see William and Mary
Ordination, Ordination Service (of Church of England), 146–7, 274, 277, 279–80, 291–2, 311–2, 328, 348
Orford, Earl of, see Russell
Orleans, Elizabeth Charlotte, Duchess of, 395–6
Ormond, Ormonde, Duke of, see Butler
"Ornaments Rubric," 277
Osborne, Sir Thomas, Earl of Danby, 156–7, 262, 264
Oudenarde, battle of, 434, 437
Overton, General Robert, 15
Oxford, 80, 161, 170, 255
Oxford, University of, 39, 166, 273, 292–3, 364, 374, 428, 443
  Merton College in, 428
Oxford, Earl of, see Harley

Padua, 211
Paisley, 90, 94
Palatinate, The, 275
Pallavicini, Cardinal, 525
Papal States, 211–2
Papin, M., 325, 561–2
Papist, see Roman Catholic
Paris, 45, 50–1, 163, 179, 185, 199–200, 209, 210, 211, 434, 449
Paris, Archbishop of, 210
Parker, S., Bishop of Oxford, 238 n, 536
Parliament of England, 11, 108, 114, 120, 136–8, 144, 147, 156 ftn, 167–70, 206–9, 228, 238, 241, 243, 253, 255, 258, 259, 268, 270–5, 283–5, 300, 307, 316–8, 337, 339–43, 345, 346–8, 362, 370–4, 384–95, 385 n, 386 n, 397, 399–401, 406–8, 412–4, 416, 418–22, 425–6 [see also Convention]
Parliament of Great Britain, 432, 435, 437, 440–52, 457, 458–9, 465–7, 469, 473
Parliament of Scotland, 13, 20, 23, 40, 41, 45, 77, 78, 115, 117–8, 122, 174–6, 338, 411–2, 425–6
Partition Treaties, 383–4, 386–7, 423–4, 448, 458
Passive Obedience, see Non-resistance
Paterson, John, Archbishop of Glasgow, 523
Paterson, John, Bishop of Ross, 90
Paterson, Mr Walter, 92 n, 93
Patrick, Dr Simon, afterwards Bishop of Chichester and of Ely, 74 n, 165, 257–8, 281, 312, 317, 332–3, 364, 375, 431
Patronage, ecclesiastical, in England, 298; in Scotland, 30, 451
Paul, the Apostle, 162, 323, 329, 468
Paul, Father, 151, 477
Paulet, Charles, 2nd Duke Bolton, 417
Payne, Henry, 535
Peace Negotiations (War of Spanish Succession), 423–5, 437–8, 447–8, 450, 457–8, 549
Pearson, John, Bishop of Chester, 312, 365
"Penal Laws" against Ecclesiastical Dissent in England, 106, 108, 114, 222, 371–2
"Penal Laws" in Ireland, 372
Pencaitland, parish of, 75
Penn, William, 219, 221–2
Penruddocks of Wiltshire, 464
Pepys, Samuel, 140
Perth, Five Articles of, 6, 6 n
Peter the Great, 348–9
Petyt, William, 152
Philip the Second of Spain, 337, 389, 438
Philip duc d'Anjou (Philip V of Spain), 384, 423, 447–8
Philiphaugh, battle of, 12
"Pietism," German, 215, 376–8, 454
Pitt, Moses, a printer, 133, 148
Pitt, William, Earl of Chatham, 450
Place Bill, Parliamentary, 316
Plato, 26, 136
Platonism, Cambridge, 39, 143
Plot, Assassination, 1695, 339–42
Plot, Popish, 153–5, 169, 170–1, 372
Plot, Protestant, 36, 185–98, 198, 200–1
  its "Rye House" (assassination) development, 188–9
Pluralities, ecclesiastical, in England, 166, 294–5, 311, 408
Pocock, Nicholas, 152
Pococke, Edward, 365
Poland, 350
Pole, Cardinal, 532
Pool, see Pole
Pope Gregory VII (see Hildebrand)
Pope Innocent XI, 181–2, 212, 214 n
Popery, see Roman Catholic
Port Royal (see also Jansenist), 51
Portland, Earl of, see Bentinck
Portsmouth, Duchess of, see Querouaille
Portugal, 458–9
Portugal, King of (Dom Alonzo VI), 245
Prerogatives of Coin and Peace and War, 174–5
Presbyterianism, English, 37–9, 105, 144–7, 274, 277, 280–1, 397–402
"Presbyterianism," French, 223
Presbyterianism, Irish, 414–5
Presbyterianism, Scotch, 4–5, 6–16, 19,

20–5, 29–30, 33, 34, 35, 37, 41–5, 54, 60–1, 63–97, 102–13, 115, 122–8, 140, 186, 229, 244, 281–2, 299, 305–6, 305 n, 318–9, 338–9, 369 ftn, 376, 381 n, 410–1, 415, 420–1, 425–6, 451 n, 451–2, 470–1, 479
"Presbyterian Eloquence," 83
Preston, battle of, 13
Prestonpans, minister of, see Paterson
Pretender, see James Edward
Prior, Matthew, 230 n
Privilege, Parliamentary, 387, 418, 445, 465
Privy Council, English, 157–8, 384, 386, 392, 425
Privy Council, English, and Ecclesiastical affairs, 403
Privy Council, Scotch, 30, 75–6, 83, 86, 90, 95
Probationer of the Church of Scotland, 20 n
Protestant, Protestantism [French], 4, 50, 181–2, 184–5, 199–200, 210, 213–5, 223, 236, 275, 315, 371, 409, 424–5
Protestantism, Continental, 168, 214–5, 279–80, 282–3, 284, 368, 471, 474
"Protesters" or Remonstrants [Scotch], 14–6, 20, 22, 37–8, 40, 76–7
Puritanism, 9, 81, 377, 415, 482

"Queen Anne's Bounty," 294, 344–5, 393, 407–8, 414, 464
Queensberry, see Douglas
Querouaille, Louise de la, 158

Radicalism, 228, 242, 422
Raleigh, Sir Walter, 151
Ramillies, battle of, 423
Ramsay, James, Rector of Glasgow University (afterwards Bishop of Dumblane and Bishop of Ross), 72–3, 78, 126, 557
Ranke, Leopold von, 151, 273, 476
Rationalist, see Latitudinarian
Raynes, Rev. Edward, 565
Rector of St Clement's Danes (Dr Hascard), 141, 197
Reformation, The, 181, 297, 298, 310, 320, 364–5, 388, 422, 470, 479, 526, 528, 529, 532, 535, 550 [see also Burnet's *Works*]
"Regale," The, 181–2, 184, 529
Regency, scheme of [1681], 170, 171, 218
Regency, scheme of [1688–9], 261–2, 264
Regency Bill of 1705, 420
Regium Donum, 414–5
Remonstrants [Dutch], see Arminian
Remonstrants [Scotch], see Protesters
Republicanism (English and Scotch), 13–6, 144–5, 238, 238 n, 242, 243, 270, 272, 336, 370, 385, 411
Reresby, Sir John, 275
Rescissory Act [Scotland], 20, 23
"Resistance," the doctrine of political, 9–10, 109–11, 145, 171, 174–6, 186, 194–6, 198, 204, 209, 241–2, 244–5, 270, 442, 453
"Resolutioners," 14–6, 22
Restoration [of Charles II], 20, 22, 28, 36, 40, 43, 75, 188, 413, 443
"Restraining Orders," 450
Revolution, The, 251 to end, *passim*
Reynolds, Richard (?), 364
Rhine, the, 211, 460
Robert the Bruce, King of Scotland, 3
Roberts, Mrs, 158–60
Robinson, John, Bishop of London (1714), 466–7
Rochester, 257, 258, 259
Rochester, Earls of, see Hyde and Wilmot
Roman Catholic, Roman Catholics, Roman Catholicism, x, 3–4, 34, 48, 50–1, 60, 83–4, 87, 92, 108–9, 114, 116, 117, 135–6, 135 n, 138, 145, 147, 150–5, 157–8, 161–3, 168–9, 173, 179–85, 199–200, 205–6, 212–4, 213 n, 229–30, 238, 243, 245, 247–8, 261–3, 270, 276, 279–80, 298, 306, 313, 314–5, 321, 323, 329, 334, 336, 360–2, 364–7, 369, 370–2, 378, 379, 381–2, 389, 397, 416, 429, 439, 448, 450–2, 454, 458, 462–3, 468, 474, 474 n, 479, 481–2, 523–7, 530
Rome, city of, 181, 211–3, 455
Rome, Court of, 212–3, 216, 468
Rosicrucians, the, 47, 172–3
Rothes, Earl of, see Leslie
Rotterdam, 48, 215, 220, 353, 430
Rouen, 36, 200
Row, John, 83
Roxburghshire, Burnetts settle in, 3
Royalist, 10–21 *passim*, 97–100, 134, 144, 145, 403, 407, 477
Royal Society, 37, 48
Royston, Richard, a printer, 148
Rufford Abbey, 164
Rullion Green, engagement of, 69
Russell, Edward (afterwards Earl of Orford), 239, 251, 340, 386–7, 441, 482
Russell, Rachel, Lady, born Wriothesley, 189–90, 196, 199, 201, 208, 209, 215, 273, 560–1, 562, 563, 565
Russell, William, Lord, 157, 165, 167–8, 170, 172–3, 186–7, 189–98, 193 n, 239, 241, 271, 317 n, 530, 560–1
Russell, William, 5th Earl and 1st Duke of Bedford, 165, 196, 197
Russell, Wriothesley, 6th Earl and 2nd Duke of Bedford, 563, 565
Rutland, Duke of, see Manners
Ruvigny, Marquis de, 199
Ryswick, Peace of, 343–5, 361–2, 364, 371, 390, 414

Sacheverell, Dr Henry, 441–5, 548
St Andrews, Archbishop of, see Sharp
St Asaph, Bishop of, see Lloyd
St Clairs of Herdmanston, the, 56, 59 n
St Clair of Herdmanston (Hermingstone), Henry, afterwards Lord Sinclair, 59, 59 n
St John, Henry, afterwards Viscount Bolingbroke, 413, 416, 422, 432, 447, 460–1, 469

Salisbury, Bishops of, see Burnet (Gilbert), Davenant, Douglass, Jewel, and Ward (Seth)
Salisbury, Cathedral of, 254, 267, 293–4, 352 n, 445, 474, 474 n
Salisbury, City of, 254, 289, 291–3, 295–6, 304, 397, 401, 402, 417, 418, 445–6, 467, 474, 475
Salisbury, Diocese of, 4 ftn, 265, 267, 289–300, 318, 354
Salisbury, Episcopal Palace at, 297, 303, 378–9, 397, 475
Salisbury Plain, 446
Saltoun, parish of, v, vi, 4 ftn, 46–8, 51 n, 51–60, 67, 69, 70, 74, 78 n, 78–9, 475
Sancroft, Dr William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 166, 182 n, 202, 204, 266–7, 304, 327–9
Sanders, Nicholas, 150–1
Sanderson, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, 312
Sands, Dr, 395
Sarum, see Salisbury
Saumur, *Theses* of, 312
Savile, George, Viscount, Earl and Marquis of Halifax, 145–6, 153–4, 157–8, 158 n, 163–5, 167–72, 176–9, 182, 185, 191–2, 194–5, 196–7, 199–200, 205–8, 210, 215, 236, 241, 254–5, 255 n, 257–8, 263, 266, 269, 271, 271 n, 274–5, 283, 289, 317–8, 333, 557–8
Savoy, House of, 336, 362, 437, 459
Scandalous Ministers, removal of, 277
"Scandalum Magnatum," 418, 445
Schism Act, the, of 1714, 467, 469
Scone, 14
Scotland, affairs of, Part I, *passim*; Part II, 131–4, 136–40, 148–50, 173–7, 186, 189, 209–10, 212, 232–5, 243, 244, 279, 281–2, 286, 303, 305–6, 318–9, 338–9, 368–70, 374, 410–3, 415, 420–1, 425–6, 435–6, 450–2, 470–1, 474 n, 475, 479–81
Scott, James, Duke of Monmouth, 156, 158, 170, 187, 189, 207–8, 209–10
Scott, Dr John, 312
Scougal, Henry, 47, 148–50, 453, 524
Scougal, Patrick, afterwards Bishop of Aberdeen, 45, 46–8, 54, 66–7, 148–50, 203
Seaforth, see Mackenzie
Security, Act of [Scotland], 411–3
Seile, Anne, 526
Settlement, Act of [England], 387, 389, 394–5, 410 ftn, 412, 456
Sewell, George, 458, 463 n, 466
Seymour, Charles, 6th Duke of Somerset, 417
Seymour, Sir Edward, 406
Shakespeare, 202, 449
Shaftesbury, Earl of, see Cooper
Sharp, James, Archbishop of St Andrews, 27–30, 34–5, 37–8, 43, 44, 61, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 90, 92, 105, 107, 124, 132
Sharp, John, afterwards Archbishop of York, 257–8, 305, 332–3, 364, 375, 420–1
Sharp, Sir William, 92 n
Sheffield, John, 3rd Earl of Mulgrave and 1st Duke of Buckingham and Normanby, 202
Sherborne, 254
Sherlock, William, dean of St Paul's, 257–8, 312
Shrewsbury, Earl and Duke, see Talbot
Sibbald, President, Sir Robert, 221, 221 n
Sicily, 459
Sidney, see Sydney
Sion House, 257
Sloane, Sir Hans, 473
Skene, Sir James, of Curriehill, 9
Smith, Dr Thomas, see Carlisle, Bishop of
Smyrna fleet, attack on, 106
Socinianism, see also Unitarianism, 49, 83, 146, 226, 283, 321–2, 325–7, 333–4, 335, 346–8, 360, 456, 456 n
Societies "for the Reformation of Manners," 376–7, 546
Societies, "Religious," 376–7, 421
Societies, "Vigilance," see Soc. for the Reform. of Manners
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 377–8
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 377–8, 547
Socrates, 212
Soissons, Comtesse de, 449–50
Somers, John, Lord, 318, 345, 374, 386–7, 387 n, 411, 413, 420, 425–6, 435, 438, 441
Somerset, Duke of, see Seymour
Sophia, Princess, see Hanover
South, Dr Robert, 368
South Sea Bubble, 456
"South Sea" (Spanish American) Trade, 386
Southwell, Secretary, 562
"Spa, the," 428–9, 439
Spalata, the Archbishop of, 364
Spanheim, Ezekiel (?), 298 n, 396 n, 564
"Spanish Succession," The, 345, 350, 382–4
Spanish Succession, War of the, 394–6, 406, 408–9, 423–5, 429–34, 437–8, 441, 446–8, 458
Spencer, Charles, 3rd Earl of Sunderland, 431, 438, 441, 445, 446
Spencer, Robert, 2nd Earl of Sunderland, 200, 319, 345, 353, 536
Spinola, Bishop, 360
Spinoza, Benedict, 167, 453
"Spittal" or Hospital Sermons, 465
Splugen, Pass, the, 211
Spottiswood, John, Archbishop of St Andrews and historian, 98, 150, 525
Sprat, Dr Thomas, afterwards Bishop of Rochester, 169
"Squadrone Volante," The, 425–6
Stafford, Viscount, see Howard
Stair, see Dalrymple
Stair, Lady (probably Eleanor, born Campbell, wife of John, 2nd Earl), 450
Stanhope, Dr George, Dean of Canterbury, 455–6

Stanhope, Philip Dormer, 4th Earl of Chesterfield, 357
Stanley, William, afterwards Dean of St Asaph, 218 n, 218–9, 221, 223–4
Stanley, Arthur Penryn, Dean of Canterbury, 299–300
Steinkirk, battle of, 316
Stern, his confession, 529
Stewart, Sir James, wrote *Jus Populi*, 109
Stewart, Mr James, 237, 537
Stewart, Anne, Countess of Traquair, born Seton, 83
Stewart, William, Earl of Traquair, 83–4
Stillingfleet, Edward, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, 38, 38 n, 116, 143, 147, 151, 153, 236, 257–8, 312, 329, 332–3, 333 ftn, 359, 364, 365, 381 n, 477, 524, 543
Stouppe, "Colonel," 210–11
Strafford, Earl, see Wentworth
Strasburg, 437
Stratford, Dr William, 53
Strype, John, 461, 565
"Styles," Old, New, and Scotch (chronological), 364 n, 371 n, 455 n
Sunderland, Earl, see Spencer
Supremacy, Royal, England, 216
Supremacy, Royal, Scotland, 77, 88, 94, 174
Surplice, use of the, 277, 324
Swift, Jonathan, afterwards Dean of St Patrick, 107, 235–6, 254, 268 n, 418, 438, 460, 463–4, 474 n, 483
Switzerland, 211–2, 214, 215, 396
Sydney, Algernon, 145, 187, 200, 228
Sydney, Henry, afterwards Earl of Romney, 217, 218 n, 241 n, 535
Sydserf, Thomas (Bishop of Galloway), 9, 12

"Tacking," Parliamentary, 372–3, 412–3, 417
Talbot, Charles, 12th Earl of Shrewsbury, afterwards Duke, 240, 270, 350, 445, 469, 482, 562
Tanner, Mr, Vicar of Lavington, 290
Tanner, Thomas, the antiquary, afterwards Bishop of St Asaph (son of the above), 290, 293
Tarbat, Lord, see Mackenzie
Tartuffe, 266
Tasso, Torquato, 180
"Templars" (law students), 457
Tenison, Thomas, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, 257–8, 329, 332–3, 342, 353–4, 358–9, 362–4, 373–5, 391 n, 391–2, 396–7, 403, 415, 422–3, 430–1, 450, 546, 564–5
"Test Acts," English, 114, 145, 216, 222, 229, 231, 237, 271–2, 397, 399–400, 407, 536
"Test Act," Scottish [1681], 173–6, 176 n
Thauler, Johann, the mystic, 46
Thevenot, M., 537
Thynne, Thomas, 529
Tiberius, the Emperor, 206
Tillotson, John, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, 38, 38 n, 142–4, 146, 168, 182, 194–6, 257–8, 273, 276–8, 280–1, 304, 308–9, 314–5, 317 n, 319, 325–30, 333 ftn, 335, 366, 541, 543–4, 556
Tilly, Mr, 421
Tindal, Matthew, 184, 422, 422 n
Tofts, Katherine, 379, 379 n, 445
Tofts, Mr and Mrs, 379, 445
Toland, John, 453
Toleration, policy of 48–9, 60–1, 63, 115, 116, 214, 243–4, 263, 269, 270, 271, 318, 321, 326, 371–2, 388, 421, 443, 446, 451–2, 471
Tonge, Dr Israel, 153
Tor Bay, 251–2
Torryburn, Minister of, see Aird
"Tory" Party, 171, 178–9, 185–6, 198, 204, 206–7, 243, 269, 283–5, 304, 307, 314, 316, 317–8, 340–3, 351, 357–8, 370, 374–5, 379, 384–7, 385 n, 390, 393–4, 397, 403, 406–7, 409–10, 412–3, 416–21, 424, 426, 431–9, 441–51, 458–67, 469, 474, 480
"Tory Hanoverians," 460, 463, 466
Toulon, attack on, 430–1
Towerson, Dr Gabriel, 312
Townshend, Charles, 2nd Viscount Townshend, 475 n
Tranent, parish of, 54
Traquair, see Stewart
Treby, Sir George, Attorney-General, 303–4, 562
Trelawny, Jonathan, Bishop of Exeter, 252, 298 n
Trent, Council of, 63, 135
Trevor, Sir John, Lord Commissioner, 294 n, 565
Triennial Bill and Act [of 1692–3], 316, 385, 414, 459
"Trimmers," 178, 269, 271, 318, 416
Trimnell, Dr Charles, afterwards Bishop of Norwich and of Winchester, 419 n
"Tulchan" Episcopacy, 4, 4 n
Turin, relief of, 423
Turks, the, 360
Turner, Sir James, 61, 69, 98, 557
Turretin, François (the elder), 312
Turretin, Jean Alphonse (the younger), 396
Tweeddale, see Hay
Tyrrwhit, Lady, a Protestant, 147
Tyrrwhit, Sir Philip, a Papist, 147

Ulster, 306
Union (Parliamentary) between England and Scotland, 410–3, 425–6, 443, 481
Unitarianism [see also Socinianism, Arianism], 48, 454, 456
United Provinces, The, 13, 41, 48–50, 87, 106, 114, 209, 211, 215–50 *passim*, 259, 263, 270, 275, 281, 307, 316, 339, 349, 350, 352 n, 358, 370, 384 n, 386, 389–90, 406, 423–4, 428–30, 435, 437–8, 458, 466

Ursin's Catechism, 81
Utrecht, 215
Utrecht, Congress, Treaty, and Peace of, 448, 457–9, 466–7
Uzzah, 134

Valence, Bishop of, 216 n
Vaninus, Lucilius, 453
Varillas, M., 153, 220, 225, 230 n, 532, 535, 555
Venice, 211–2, 431
Versailles, 199–200
Via Mala, 211
"Via Media" (in the Predestinarian Controversy), 312, 398, 399 n
Victoria, Queen, 392, 484
Vienna, 430
Villiers, Edward, 1st Earl of Jersey, 374–5, 375 n, 386–7
Villiers, Elizabeth (afterwards Countess of Orkney), 332, 352, 372–3, 375, 391
Villiers, George, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, 42, 87, 116, (his Rehearsal) 202
Visitation of the Sick, Service for, reform of, 279

Waddesworth, Mr, 204
Wake, Dr William, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, 257–8
Walker, Obadiah, 535
Waller, Edmund, 180, 560
Wallis, Dr John, 39, 39 n
Walpole, Sir Robert, 475 n
Ward, Seth, Bishop of Salisbury, 265
Warriston, Lord, see Johnston
"Warwick Petition," The, 389
Waterloo, battle of, 409
Watson, Thomas, Bishop of St Davids, 258, 358–9
Wedderburn, Mr, 95
Wentworth, Thomas, 1st Earl of Strafford, 133, 168, 340
Westminster Confession, 19
Westphalia, peace of, 361–2
Wharton, Anne, born Lee, 177–81, 415, 559–60
Wharton, Henry, see "Harmer, Anthony"
Wharton, Thomas, 1st Marquis of Wharton, 180, 415, 420, 420 n, 441, 443, 466, 467, 474 n, 560
Whichcote, Dr Benjamin, 38
"Whig" party, 170–1, 176, 178, 185–98, 201, 208, 209, 215, 217, 243–4, 264, 269, 270, 272, 274, 283–5, 307, 316–9, 329, 340–3, 350–1, 356–7, 358–9, 370, 374, 381–2, 384–7, 385 n, 390, 394, 397, 401, 404, 406, 409–12, 415–6, 419–22, 424, 429–38, 440–51, 457–9, 464, 466–7, 480
"Whigs" (or "Hanoverians") of Scotland, 410
Whiston, William, 452, 454, 454 n
Whitaker, William, 364
Whitby, Dr Daniel, 419 n
White, Marquis D'Albeville, 222, 223, 234, 235
Whitgift, Dr John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 364
Whole Duty of Man, 312
Wickliffe, John, 479, 555
Wigton, Lady, see Fleming
Wilberforce, Samuel, Bishop of Oxford, 287, 289, 290, 293, 298–9, 323
Wilkins, John, D.D., afterwards Bishop of Chester, 38, 38 n, 179, 312, 477
William, Prince of Orange, afterwards King William III, 109, 170, 209, 215–9, 221–3, 229, 232, 234 n, 237–9, 240–72, 254 n, 276, 281–6, 296, 297 n, 300–1, 304–5, 307–8, 314, 316–20, 318 n, 329–30, 332, 336–40, 341 n, 342–6, 344 n, 348, 350–4, 358, 361–2, 364–5, 370–5, 382–95, 384 n, 391 n *bis*, 410, 421, 448, 455, 458, 538–545 *passim*, 556
Williams, Dr John, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, 333 ftn, 364, 543, 545
Wilmot, John, 2nd Earl of Rochester, 161, 164–7, 177, 179, 333, 526, 559 (3 refs.)
Wiltshire, 289
Wiltshire, a county election in, 417
Winchester, Bishop of, see Mews
Winchester, see of, 351 n, 374
Windsor, 255–7, 267, 286, 289, 354
Wishart, George, Bishop of Edinburgh, 52, 55, 58, 60, 67–9, 557
Wodrow, Robert, 90, 92, 95, 105, 124, 172, 199, 450 ftn, 450 n, 451, 456, 470–1
Wolfenbuttle, Wolfenbüttel, 396
Wollebius, 81
Wood, Anthony à, 153
Woodstock, 164
Worcester, battle of, 14, 15
Wotton, William, 293, 293 n
Wren, Sir Christopher, 141

Xenophon, 355

Yester, 26, 45, 46
York, chapter of, 368
York, Duke of, see James
Young, Dr, Bishop of Edinburgh, 113
Young, Dr, Dean of Sarum, 418, 547, 556
Younger, Dr, Dean of Sarum, 300, 418–9, 564–5
"Yule Vacation," 451

Zell, Duke of, 396
Zuicker, Daniel, 49
Zurich, 211, 471
Zuylestein, Count, 256

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

45214 92
B935
Clarke, T.E.S.
AUTHOR
Life of Gilbert Burnet
TITLE

92
B.935

45214

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00078967